THE TRUTH OF
THE HISTORY OF
THE LATE MIDDLE AGES

The Falsification of German History

Volume II

THE TRUTH OF THE HISTORY OF THE LATE MIDDLE AGES

By Wilhelm Kammeier

1940

Adolf Klein Verlag, Schkeuditz bei Leipzig

The Historical Mysteries of the World

Replies to my Critics

Table of contents

Translator's note 6

Preface 7

Book 1 8

1. Expert, help!

2. Falsification of German History

3. The Historical Mysteries of the World

Book 2 33

Mystery Rome in the Middle Ages

Introduction: Humanism as the stage for the falsification action

1. The religious-psychological mystery of the Babylonian exile of the church

2. The mystery of the city of Rome in the Middle Ages

3. The historical quintessence of the Rome mystery

4. The mystery of the medieval Heretics

5. The critical central problem of the Heretics' history

6. The so-called schism of the church as the root cause of the falsification action

Literature index (Endnotes)

Addendum

Book 3 87

Dogmatic Christianity and History Falsification

Introduction: First things: The Method

1. The lie of the origin of the big schism of the church

2. The problem of the existence of medieval regional churches

3. Particular dogma and dogma-free Christianity

4. Idea and implementation of the universal dogma

5. The creation of the French national church

6. The root cause of the German discord in the late Middle Ages

7. The French national dogma as a pan-folkish power

Literature index (Endnotes)

Book 4 **149**

The formation of the Roman universal church

Introduction: The necessity of historical-critical logic

1. The religious-political main problems of the 14th century

2. Ludwig the Bavarian and the problem of the secularity of the clergy

3. First attempt of the creation of a German-Italian counter-popedom

4. The counterstrike of the French national popedom

5. Enormous strengthening of the "secular" priesthood under the parson[I] King

6. On the way to the second German-Italian extra-popedom

7. From the alleged "schism" to the foundation of the Roman universal church

Literature index (Endnotes)

[I] orig.: 'Pfaffenkönig'; historically, 'Pfaffe', here used as a prefix, is ***the*** general German ***derogatory*** term for ***any*** member of the clergy of ***any*** '***christian***' 'denomination'. I personally remember that word still being in use in the '1960's through to the 90s, with that described meaning. I have searched far and wide, but was unable to find an English language equivalent.

Translator's note

Dear reader,

before you endeavour on the lecture of this here work, it is most strongly recommended (in the sense of being somewhat obligatory) that you read the previous Volume 1 (*Falsification of German History*), if you haven't already done so. Else, you may not be able to grasp the bottom line of Kammeier's work at all, and end up calling any hint at falsified history "falsification crap", the way one of my previously well-meaning acquaintances did when hearing about it.

This is also the reason why Volume 1 had to be translated first, this Volume here 2nd, and the real cracker, Volume 3, will come next/third, to conclude the cycle.

Should an opportunity arise to obtain the mentioned *Neue Beweise* (Book 5 of Volume 1), that would come fourth/last, as a supplement. (It has been obtained in the meantime, but I'll do away with the translation, because there are no new aspects being presented in it.)

Everything else as per translator's address in Volume 1, except: the 'K.' in the square brackets indicates Kammeier's original input.

Enjoy the ride.

Swindon, UK, October '2022'

Friedrich August Wilhelm Erxleben d.J.

P.S.: Share, share, share – the information!

P.P.S.: After translating the first volume of Kammeier's works, *The Falsification of German History*, I read the *Thule* trilogy by Wilhelm Landig. In it, reference is made repeatedly to an *Edda*. I hadn't heard of it before (and I'm ashamed for it); it seems to be not all too dissimilar from the Nibelungen or Beowulf legends in terms of age and provenance. So, I dug up some literature on this Edda, and wouldn't you know it - the same copyists must have been at work here as in all of Kammeier's investigated cases. First book I open (Wilkens – *Investigations on the Snorra Edda*, 1878, quote from the Preface, translated from German):

"In none of the preserved editions are all parts complete… deviations… written around 1300… with many in part content-disfiguring mistakes by the copyist… not without abridging the original… [scripts] Bb… U… W and R… often deviating [from each other]"

and so on and so on, and all of *The Falsification of German History* was flashing up again in my memory…

After a breathless moment, I started laughing from happiness over having found Kammeier.

Preface

After the publication of *The Falsification of German History* and *New Evidence for the Falsification of German History* (both Adolf Klein Verlag, Schkeuditz near Leipzig), it was my intention to continue, in a straight line, my work of demonstrating by evidence that the history of the occidental Middle Ages has been falsified from the ground up following an action led by Rome. I intended to consider and answer critique only, if a critic would step forward with plausible, factual counter-proof, i.e. if their critique would be more than a mere expression of disapproval. Critique is the direct counter-attack against certain positions reinforced by the "opposition"; disapproval is moaning about the uncomfortable opposition. One to disapprove well is for example Armin Tille (in *Rasse* [*Race*], 1936, p 72, 73). He sees in me, who is struggling for historical truth, a false prophet against whom he has to caution! Just what might his true prophets be made of? Should it really get to the point that even the German, the truest human being in the world, will not accept, or cannot bear, truth anymore? Where then is the persecuted truth to find any refuge if not amongst the Germans?

Already previously, a review by Günther Franz had been published in *Volk im Werden* (1935, p 433 ff.) [*Volk*[II] *in the Making*]. It was only remarkable in the sense that I was able to demonstrate by it (*Neue Beweise*, p 16, 17) how critique against my work should *not* be. Namely, Franz aims his arrow at a place where I am not yet standing. Franz does not refute me, but merely accuses me of all sorts which I had allegedly forgotten. I replied to him that the "forgotten" would be discussed at the relevant time; in the meantime, certainly, he could refute the evidence provided by me so far.

Professor Heimpel then has, in the Issue 4/36 of the *Offenes Visier* [*Open Visor*], undertaken the first attempt at possibly shattering individual of my thesis' by matter-of-fact counter arguments. As not to be expected any other way, the attempt has failed. What in fact did shake me up, was that Heimpel, for the reinforcement of his position, found himself pushed to point out, of all things, Franz' "devastating review" with recommendation. Just what perception must Heimpel have of a "devastating critique", when even this innocent review appears to him as such, I asked myself, shaking my head.

Now, I would of course likely not have replied as swiftly to Heimpel's failed refutation attempt, had not the request been addressed to me by various parties to hear my opinion about what Heimpel had presented. A specialist scientist had commented on the matter, an authority had spoken and condemned! We know of course what impression the statement of an expert can leave. I was no longer permitted to remain silent, and therefore, in the magazine *Die Völkische Schule* [*The Folkish School*], I took the opportunity to reply to Heimpel's article. Due to the limitation of the format, my reply had to come out in brief; much else which I should have presented had to be silenced in that place. For the readers of my writings however, it is important

[II] As you can see, dear reader, I have finally introduced this word 'volk' (united folks of the same language and culture, roughly) to the English language (as an English noun, not usually capitalised of course), because there is not one equivalent to be found in it that wouldn't, at the same time, carry other/different meanings aplenty, not 'folk', although it once was the same as 'Volk', not 'people' – what to do, what to do, dear reader?

to learn more about the character and the validity of the opposition's attempts at critique, and for that reason, I have decided on the following in-depth explanations.

1. Expert, help!

My critics count amongst the so-called experts, by position and provenance; I am an autodidact. In the eyes of some readers, the attribute 'expert' gives my critics' statements a priori, and equally automatically, a greater weight. It is to be examined whether this greater weight has its justification without exception, i.e. in my case, too, for example.

Once the expert has spoken, we think of Prof. Heimpel for a moment, the subject to be discussed is considered closed by some readers. This or that reader may think that the versed expert must of course surely know what is valid on the subject. However, quite some readers do not know that it is quite another matter with authorities on history. Namely, an expert in the realm of historical science (of the Middle Ages), the way the reader imagines them to be, does not exist at all: only *specialists* on history exist. During the course of the previous century, the enormous field of medieval historical research has been divided into different allotments. Such allotments are for example diplomatics (document science), palaeography (ancient script science), legal history, history of the Carolingians. Now, each allotment is being worked on by certain specialist experts, and by that, no doubt, an economical maintenance of the individual parts is guaranteed. However, every specialism has, for obvious reasons, its drawbacks: it narrows the perspective. Rarely, and if so, strenuously, does the glance rise up to and beyond the vastness of the historical realm from the fenced off individual scientific historical works. Such a real and proper specialist hardly dares gaining advisory and decisive influence on the works of their neighbour across the fence of his little scientific allotment; they would be rejected as intruders. In his own allotment, yes, there, over time and under the right conditions, they are acknowledged as certified experts, especially if they can confirm the findings of their allotment colleagues. In the other allotments, they are at best tolerated as guests, if they behave modestly.

T Mommsen has once justly stigmatised this "amateurish limitation of the work to the next craftsmen colleagues", who "consider it sinful" to work in other areas. (*Neues Archiv* vol. 5, p 56) Here, such neighbourly envy and arguing of the history specialist experts is of no further concern to us. We simply establish: experts in the sense of an extensive mastery of the medieval universal history do not exist. Experts only exist for the individual specialist areas, but not for the entire realm.

But what does this finding have to do with, for example, Heimpel's critique against my thesis'? Temporarily, and at this point, it has actually nothing to do with that critique, but with the readers' attitude towards this attempt at critique. Namely, the above finding is capable of preventing my readers from getting scared off just because a history professor is starting to talk. The finding prompts to consider that the attempts at critique by a history "expert", when they air their opinions on the *overall realm* of medieval history, are by no means to be taken for the final word of judgement. On the other hand, this is just the way it is: my research spreads across the *entire* realm of medieval historical sources, and he who wants to criticise me as an expert, must necessarily, as an expert, be at home in the entire realm! This universal expert has yet to be born; at any rate, their name is not Franz, Tille or Heimpel. One is not to misunderstand me. Far from me is it, from this pickle, to form an accusation against the historians who are forced to this specialisation by the enormous vastness of the subject. I would simply like to hint at the readers – and at the history professors themselves, by the way – that any critique of my thesis', especially a "devastating" one, turns out to be far more difficult than it may still be generally imagined.

Also, with critique, one should not be looking who wrote it but what it carries in terms of internal critical substance. A critique is not already of convincing or even "devastating" effect just because it has been composed by an authority, because sometimes, especially the authority is hopelessly entangled and caught in methodical and expertly prejudices. Oftentimes, this becomes apparent particularly beautifully when one history expert criticises another one. In such cases, one can conduct the most educational studies. For example, my critic G Franz has been overwhelmed by the tragedy that he himself, in his very own area (history of the Peasant War), has been harshly criticised by another specialist expert on the subject. Over this, he had to concede some ruffled feathers. His counter-expert and critic puts it to him: "This work transforms the German peasant into a narrowness, not to say a distortion, which does justice neither to himself [the German peasant] nor his 'war'." (Review of Franz' book in *Göttingensche Gelehrte Anzeigen* 1936, p 208, by W Stolze, [*Göttingen Learned Announcements*]). I do not know whether Franz has taken this critique to heart, I did not, at any rate, take his review of my book to heart.

Expert, help!

After these necessary preparatory remarks on the limitations of power of critique with historical science experts in general, I now turn to the particular problem: in which peculiar state history expert critique is caught with regards to the results of my research. Why, the novelty which does not fit the accustomed framework is just that I do not labour on a specialist subject, but that I place the entire medieval source material on my examination desk. Naturally, not all at once, but nicely one by one. So, let us have a look at how my critics have accepted this novel situation so far.

At the first consternation of the by me discovered nature, more accurately un-nature, of the medieval tradition, the cry for expert help arose instantly. The almighty experts were prompted "to show the way too

high aiming critic his place!" (M D Johannes in the October 1935 issue of the *Hammer*) This cry for help quite intensely reveals the affectionate trust in the level of power of the critique of expert science. Johannes imagines the expert scientists to be in possession of a finely designed, absolutely reliable scale of critique. In his opinion, my thesis' are weighed on this scale. Indeed, the experts do possess such a scale: it is the classical *relative method*. So far, it has always been working perfectly – that is to say, up to yesterday, the experts lived in that belief – and no doubts were raised against the weighing results. But what if it could be shown that the usual and inherited weighing pieces are no good? That their calibration is not fixed and absolute, but constantly changing and relative? This proof of the relativity of all previous research results has been demonstrated by me. But with this now, historians have lost their grip on the scale of critique. They are now utterly helplessly facing my process of evidence. They are no longer in any position at all to criticise my thesis', let alone refute them. If they want to criticise, they have to, whether they like it or not, find a new scale, they have to get used to handling my *absolute* method. I can empathise with the expert historians, that this situation is very embarrassing for them. Thus, my readers may rest assured: I need not be afraid of the experts, quite the opposite, I am awaiting their judgement in all-soulful peace. He who wants to criticise me, necessarily has to deploy the absolute method, and in doing so, every attempt at critique is equally necessarily leading to an involuntary *confirmation* of my thesis. I dare hope that this peculiar state of affairs is already dawning on the more understanding amongst the expert scientists. I conclude this from Heimpel's finding: that my method of critique has a lethal effect! (Lethal on *falsified* history, indeed!)

Only a collector of analecta?

Several history professors tell those who want to hear it, and those who don't, that my thesis' are already badly founded because – according to their non-authoritative opinion – I lack the required "thorough knowledge" of the sources. Kammeier is not a sevenfold tested expert, they assure us, so, with him, where is the "thorough" source knowledge supposedly coming from? So, according to this argument, a person can acquire knowledge exclusively by the richly blessed institution that is the exam board. Really exclusively? Should it be impossible that an autodidact, quite without exams, simply via intensive study of the subject, can work himself up to the lofty mental heights where the huts of the experts with promotions stand? Perhaps they do not arrive up there with as much regulation "knowledge" as the officially calibrated experts, but that does not matter at all, because it is almost always the big mistake of the expert history scientists that they – know too much! Often enough, they are standing still from all that knowledge and then some; the mass of their "science" is paralysed and in the process of petrification. With all that knowledge, they have completely locked out the path to the basic problems. Albert Schweitzer has very pointedly characterised this danger of the "retarding knowledge" with the history-researching theologists. What he says does exactly apply to the "secular" historians: "More often however, the knowledge of history provides the »service« that it keeps down new historical understanding for as long as possible, that it deploys all possibilities against the only reality… This retarding knowledge is the virtue of theology [historical science; insert by Kammeier], where, up to the

present day, admirable erudition is often merely used to delude oneself over elementary findings, and to replace the natural with the artificial." (A Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, 1926, p 25) [*History of the Research on the Life of Jesus*] In numerous places of my writings, I had to point out the unnatural and artificial, overgrowing all the natural, in historical science, as much as Schweitzer did here with regards to the realm of theology. Primarily important is not as much detailed knowledge as possible, not a rucksack full of isolated information and knowledge fragments, but the bright consciousness of the necessary foundation of all detail knowledge through rock-solid basic concepts.

And here now, I have to show my colours – even at the risk of being condemned as an immodest person: I know quite well, and thoroughly so, what is primarily at the heart of the matter with the historical sources of the Middle Ages with regards to my task.

There is another variation of source ignorance of which I am accused. A Tille is the man who has delivered the necessary enlightenment on this to the audience. (*Rasse*, 1936, p 72, 73) He makes himself heard as follows: "For the proof of his claim, he [Kammeier] has exploited the writings of historical science, but that he has conducted such examination under observance of a hand-writing comparison, or at least made an attempt at doing so, is nowhere to be noticed." Oh really, Tille has not noticed anything. Despite this, or perhaps just because of this, he will permit that I – and every attentive reader of my book – find this statement a little peculiar, not to say comical. Namely: the "examinations under observance of a hand-writing comparison", so badly missed by Tille despite the diligent lecture of my book, I have not only attempted to carry out, but I actually did carry out (Vol. 1, Book 1). Unfortunately, this performed attempt at hand-writing comparison has, for some reason, not entered Tille's consciousness, he has not noticed anything. Perhaps, after so bravely reprimanding me, he will take the opportunity in the not so far future to carefully read my book.

It would then perhaps not be entirely ruled out, that, following a thorough lecture, Tille's bad opinion of my accomplishment and modus operandi could experience some improvement. According to Tille, what characterises my modus operandi? I "exploit the writings of historical science". So, I get myself 100 books of writings of historical science from the library, take excerpts from each book, and then arrange these analecta to a new book. Indeed, as has been rumoured, some books have been introduced to the world in this manner! Allegedly, I have also done so. But where is my own contribution in this?? Tille has been unable to discover it; only here and there, he has found some monstrous claims unpleasantly noticeable in my book, which likely have to originate with myself, since they are nowhere to be found in the "exploited writings". Now, modesty certainly is a pretty embellishment, especially with people who have no other accomplishment to show for. However, if one wants to show me up as a modest collector of analecta of historical science who has no own accomplishment to present, I am in no mind to keep quiet about this hardly surpassable modesty and classification. It is a bitter thing having to point out one's own accomplishment, but with a view on my readers, I am unfortunately forced to do so. If I remained silent, my silence might possibly be interpreted as a confession of the worthlessness of my writings.

G Franz has at least been prepared to some minimal acknowledgement with the words: "Kammeier makes the odd remark that we expert scientists may follow up." (*Volk im Werden*, 1935, p 435) This is a very moderate acknowledgement, and I wonder in amazement, whether in my writings, the experts have really been unable (or unwilling?) to find any more of my own accomplishment than a few remarks in passing? Fact however, is the following: by now already, in my writings, I have made a gift to the expert historians by a whole mountain of new problems - and their solution on top – of which they, so far, had no idea, and these are not the kind of miniature problems which, in the field of source research, can be found roaming in packs, but problems of fundamental significance. But I have also accomplished something more: I have renewed the foundations of historical science itself, with regards to authenticity research, by showing up as pseudo-critical the classical relative method which is to be replaced by the absolute method created by me. And that is of course something different and something more than merely collecting analecta.

Stop, this is not what I meant by my earlier words!, we hear Tille's voice from the background. What I meant is much rather this, he shouts: Kammeier exclusively uses the results of his predecessors, without having examined and compared the hand-writings and documents in the archives himself. One only has a right to "exploit" the existing writings if one has held the documents or chronicles in their own hands in the archives, and only then. Yeahyeah, Tille is right! It must be so – relieved, all experts enthusiastically agree.

Kammeier has not examined the diplomas and codices himself. Apparently, this is the finding Tille wanted to pass on to his audience, when he expressed his displeasure with my exploitation in his review. On this point now, I have to make this principal declaration on the *particularity of my task and my modus operandi*.

Firstly: I am not in the "fortunate" position of being the gardener of a little scientific history allotment, i.e. being a specialist in a fenced off partial area of historical source research. Much rather, I have to critically examine the entire enormous vastness of medieval sources, regardless of whether it may be about diplomas or chronicles, the history of law, coins or art, or whatever else.

Secondly: my task does *not* consist of establishing potential relations between the sources via relative comparison (the way history relativists do), but my task requires examining the sources in detail and overall for their reaction in the medium of living present experience. The point where the relativists stop, is the very point where my work only begins. For example, it is not for me to examine which date of the ten different handed down dates of a medieval "historical" event is the "right" one, but I have to find the reason why this event could have been mysteriously handed down by alleged contemporaries and eye witnesses under ten different dates. To speak within the example: my task is that of the judge of a main trial who, on the basis of the established factual evidence by the preliminary judges, has to come to a final verdict (on authenticity, or in-authenticity, respectively). The acquisition of the actual material *is not my task*! I need not care for the acquisition, either, because the material has already been delivered: for my examination, it is readily available,

in abundance, in numerous expert magazines of historical science. Since one hundred years ago, the source researchers have, time and again anew, examined the chronicles and documents with a diligence that I am praising to the utmost not for the first time here, and they have also explained their findings in the most desirable copiousness. This preparatory work of clarification, so diligently carried out, is by its nature, as already often highlighted, a relative work. This relative work, and with it, the classical relative method, is by no means worthless. The classical relative method had, and will even always keep, its special justification, namely with regards to the *preparatory* (relativistic) research of the sources. Only, this method does not exactly deliver what all researchers had expected of it so far: to establish authenticity. At the very moment at which the relative method is to be handled beyond its (relative) task for the decision on the question of authenticity, it fails, and has to be replaced by the absolute method.

Thus, if I am confronted: you do not carry out the (relativistic) examination of the sources in the archives, my response is this: I would not dream of frittering away my time with tasks that have already been accomplished by other men with much diligence and the best of success. And if one counters: but the so far established comparison results, almost all, contradict each other, then I have to respond: it is just this that is the mysterious phenomenon that I want to examine and trace back to its root cause. Has one then really not yet understood that my task is fundamentally different from that of the old school expert historians? But suppose for a moment, I agreed to the posed demand, and I endeavoured, in the archives, to examine the chronicles and documents once again – perhaps for the hundredth time – for their nature and their state of relations (via the relative method) – when, meine Herren[III], am I supposed to complete this work at all?? I would still be stuck in the middle of this work at the age of 100, even 200! Why? Because, different to other "lucky ones", I do not have to plough the field of a small scientific history allotment, but because I have to have a researching view on the *entire stock* of medieval sources. But that an examination of *all* existing diplomas and chronicles is a thing of impossibility, needs not be mentioned. Thus, since for my purposes, material is at my disposal in abundance, I spryly set to work, such necessary work, and I would not dream of wasting my time and strength on examinations which have already been carried out so well by so many others.

[III] 'my Sirs' perhaps, or 'Misters', 'messieurs', 'Mssrs.', just so long as it doesn't read 'gent(i)lemen', which I consider a mock-term like 'goy'.

2. Falsification of German History

A response to the article of Professor Dr. Heimpel, Leipzig, in the issue 4/36 of the *Offenes Visier* (First published in the issue 7/36 of the *Völkische Schule* [*Folkish School*].

Following a request of the editors of the *Offenes Visier*, Professor Heimpel has responded with a critique on the results of my works *The falsification of German History* and the only recently published supplementary book *New Evidence*. With consideration for the limited space, he had to forbid himself to deliver "counter-proof", but he thinks himself in a position to refute with ease, on the grounds of some samples, so to speak, to demonstrate for everybody to grasp, that my work is quite a failure, and that my cause is now an already lost one. Of course, Professor Heimpel is not denying my good intentions, and for that, I thank him. Two indispensable attributes must be inborn and natural to the character of a scientific critic: *veracity and consequence*. They must not be side-tracked or put off by anything, in completely, and in all clarity, pointing out a once established *basic truth*, as much as his critical means permit. Every basic truth is crucially vital and volk-supportive, and wherever such basic truth were to be suppressed, the sound development of a volk, and ultimately that of mankind, would suffer the heaviest damage. By today, this insight has become spiritual commonplace [in the German Empire], thanks to the victory of the national-socialist world view, which has put at the centre of the folkish confidence the basic values of blood and race, which had been kept buried systematically and for such a long time. "The truth", says Albert Schweitzer, "is more valuable than the non-truth under any circumstance. This has to also apply to historical truth." Now, if even the history of an entire world era is systematically falsified, the duty to veracity demands of me, who has uncovered this forgery enterprise, to clarify and stigmatise this crime against humanity to its last root causes and effects with inexorable consequence. I must therefore not remain idle when a scientific expert authority, of whose pure intentions I am convinced, is trying to discredit my results as "nonsensical thesis'". Thus, in the following, I will briefly give the necessary answers to the by Professor Heimpel presented counter-arguments, and in doing so, it will be shown how helplessly traditional expert science is facing my thesis, and how the supposed "refutations" can easily, root and branch, be proven to be pathetically weak and obsolete. The careless talk of a "devastating" critique of my results should then finally, by these few lines, with all sincerely truth-seeking readers of my writings, lose all future credit.

1. The axiomatic foundation of my critique. Relative and absolute method.

At the beginning of his article, Prof. Heimpel talks of the "wrong premises" from which I draw my conclusions; however, this point, he barely touches, quite flightily in sneaking past, and that is very much a pity. Premises are of course the foundations of any thought structure. Especially on my allegedly "wrong premises", he should have aired some decisive statements. I know very well however, what prompted Prof. Heimpel to not spryly touch on this sore spot, because a sore spot it is – however, *not* in the foundation of *my* structure of critique, but in the – alas! – regrettably so fragile foundation of historical expert science. In brief,

this is about the *method of critique* in the realm of authenticity research. I shall make up for that pesky neglect, because with the question of the method, the axiomatic foundation of my critique is under scrutiny, and once the reader has gained a clear insight into this, they will then not lack the means of a basic judgement with regards to the supposedly "devastating" critique of my general thesis.

If the readers suspect that my method of critique is different from the usual classical method, they are right: namely, the traditional method is, by its nature, a *relative* one, and mine is an *absolute* one. With some horror, the reader has learned from Prof Heimpel that my method is to have a lethal effect. This is quite correct. However, the lethal effect of my per se innocent method does not lie in its nature, but it is caused by the nature of the *subject* of this method, namely the pseudo-historical substance. Applied to a *falsified* tradition, my method works absolutely devastatingly, and that is its great advantage and blessing. Now, in order to show of what the difference between mine and the classical method consists, I do not want to get involved in philosophically edgy discussions, but highlight their mutual nature with a concrete example.

So, let us suppose that I fabricate, aided by suitable means, artificial pearls – that means I fabricate *forged* ones – 100 of them. The result of my forgery attempt be the following: 75 pearls turn out to be a flawless success; substantially, they resemble each other like one egg does the other. 15 of the fabricated pearls show certain small deficiencies and deviations, and 10 are completely botched. I put these 100 pearls into a bowl, well mixed, then I take them to Prof. Heimpel, and ask him to help me separate the genuine ones, because apparently, amongst them, there are some that are not genuine. Not a problem at all, says Prof. Heimpel, and enthusiastically sets out, by careful comparison (*relative* method!), to detect the "genuine" pieces. His sorting is soon finished, and he points at three stacked up piles. You see, he says, these 75 pieces are indubitably genuine – just carefully compare them! Equally indubitably, these 10 pieces are forged – please compare them with the genuine ones! And for this pile of 15, he continues, I have to keep my verdict open; could be that they are not genuine, but they might as well be merely peculiar variations of the indubitably genuine pieces. Alas, by uncovering the true state of affairs, I have to confront Prof. Heimpel with a massive and unexpected disappointment. Of course now, he soon realises that he, in order to solve the question of authenticity, has to venture down an entirely different path: he has to steer his attention per se away from the bowl and find an entirely different measure of comparison! He has to ask the living nature! He has to take truly genuine, i.e. naturally grown pearls, as the measure of his critical examination of the bowl's contents! In a word: *from the bowl away, towards living nature*! (Absolute method)

Much like with our bowl's contents lies the case with regards to the "historical" overall tradition of the Middle Ages available to us. Just what actually is available to us here? Masses of paper in the form of documents and codices, i.e. literature. *Available is literature, and nothing but literature*! That we consider this literature a result of previous history is based on "good faith", on an assumption leadingly suggested to us, which movingly attests to our capacity for belief, but has nothing at all to do with scientific certainty. *Namely, that this literature is really the result of previous historical events, has yet to be proven to begin with*! It has

not yet been proven at all, because with the *relative* method of critique, such proof simply cannot be conducted. And he who remains stuck in the bowl of the "historical" mass of pearls, must inevitably delve in relative pseudo-critique. Since I have demonstrated in my writings that the literary tradition available to us is riddled to the core with obvious forgery hearths, it is a sin against veracity and scientism to further view the mass of literature available to us as the result of history, simply on an inherited good faith. From now on, this alleged historical tradition in its entirety is under the suspicion of being of artificial nature, i.e. falsified. Now, it is no longer viable wanting to decide, via the traditional method, the question of authenticity by *relative* comparison of the historical "pearl" facts amongst each other, but much like in the pearl example, here, too, we must turn away from the bowl, i.e. the paper and the tradition, and towards the living nature. We must no longer look inside the paper bowl for our yardsticks of critique, but in an *extra-historical* circumstance. *But this circumstance is the living present experience*! Exclusively via this by myself formulated *absolute* method are we in the position to bring to an objectively certain decision the question of the true nature of the medieval tradition (whether authentic or not). The classical relative critique of comparison has revealed itself to be a blind pseudo-critique; he who still deploys it today, can therefore no longer raise any claim to a scientific character of their findings.

2. Substantial or accidental falsification?

Prof. Heimpel makes the accusation that I "stare only at" my "difficulties", i.e. I take issue with the documents with dating and other errors, but that I do not account for the "unobjectionable" pieces. I ask him: what? Then, should the humanistic forgers not have managed to also fabricate such pieces that have *turned out so excellently*, that the classical relative critique is simply unable in these cases to establish the falsification with their blind methods? On this point, the utter helplessness of the relative comparison critique becomes blatantly obvious. I herewith address to Prof. Heimpel and all diplomatists the invitation to give me confirmation that they, with their relative methods, are principally unable to establish carefully fabricated forgeries as such! For this, too, my method presents a handle, e.g. viewed from the side of the "itinerary" complex. Now, why I stare so intensely at the forgery brands of the medieval "historical" substance, I want to explain by a concrete example again. We ask an inn-keeper for a measure of wine, but with the first swig, we taste that this "wine" has been thoroughly watered down. Now, even Prof. Heimpel will not be able to suppress a hearty laugh when the embarrassed inn-keeper assures him: but dear Mr Professor, well and truly, there is not only water in the mug, there is *also some* wine in there! This "wine", simply by this adulteration, is no longer wine, and exactly this is the case with the medieval historical substance. It, too, has been substantially changed by thorough adulteration. Namely, it is not perhaps the case that merely one itsy-bitsy forgery action has taken place, whose superficially impurifying elements could easily be removed again via relative separation, but a systematic general enterprise has transformed the nature of the historical substance. The way we intensely focus on the watery element with the watered down wine, in the case of the falsified medieval "history", we focus naturally and equally involuntarily at the through and through contaminating forgery hearths. Namely,

true history must not show the forgery elements revealed by me, and it does not substantially carry them, either.

3. Prof. Heimpel takes a rearward defensive position

In order to illustrate how often I "stared" at difficulties which actually weren't such, or which could at least be explained playfully simply, Prof. Heimpel, with the contested dating errors for example, points to the "solution" which revealed itself in the fact that in the Middle Ages, *different year beginnings* were known and applied. This hint at "different periods of the year" is very interesting, because in doing so, Prof. Heimpel is retreating to a defensive position that once, 200 years ago, had been most scantily slapped together by the Benedictines (Mauriners), but which in the meantime, has long been abandoned again by expert science itself. Back then, the Benedictines had not been vexed by the greatest pains if it meant securing possibly all documents as authentic. Thus, they explained the monstrous confusion in the date entries of the *years of reign* of a ruler with the courage of desperation by the assumption that the document scribes had – to us of course appearing very mysterious – the custom of applying two, and even more, different opening epochs to the period of reign of their Kings. King Robert of France, for example, is showing at least 5 (!) different opening dates for his period of reign! (*Neues Lehrgebäude*, 9. Teil, p 31) [*New House of Learning*, Pt. 9] As a result, according to the Benedictines' opinion, the document scribes, at pleasure and personal preference (!), and higgledy-piggledy (!), took as a basis for their dating today this, and tomorrow that opening epoch!! That is – without their documents revealing to us which epoch actually was meant to be standard in the individual case!! What kind of dating nonsense has sprung from this, everybody can imagine. Now, Prof. Heimpel knows as well as I do, that, as early as 100 years ago, this "ingenious solution" of the Mauriners has been sharply rejected by J F Böhmer with a reference to sound common sense. "In that respect", Böhmer says (*Regesta Imperii I*, preface), "I declare myself in opposition to all my predecessors, and namely against the French Benedictines. Surely, it should have been realised that, if the one and the same regent, at the same time, had calculated his years of reign (without indicating so to the outside world) by two, three or even four different epochs, by doing so, all year calculations by years of reign would have been rendered invalid." Up to yesterday then, the other diplomatists have happily joined Böhmer in dispensing with the Maurinian "solution" – today, all of a sudden, the drowning diplomatical science is clutching even that straw again!

4. The Einhard enigma is of a psychological nature

That Prof. Heimpel was not having an easy time at all in "devastatingly" refuting my thesis', is witnessed by his flatly breathing arguments at the point where he refers to a special case, namely Einhard. The tone of resignation is reverberating through the room, and the slightly disappointed reader has to be pepped up by Prof. Heimpel: don't despair! If we, Prof. Heimpel encourages us, only applied a "sensible treatment of the text in cooperation with countless other news", we could, for example, determine Charles' year of death beyond doubt. Here however, Prof. Heimpel has subconsciously performed a switch of the problem at hand!

In the case of the *Vita Caroli*, it is not at all about determining Charles' year of death or his years of reign by referencing all sorts of *other* (!) news, but the problem lies firmly rooted in the *Vita* itself. This is about the *statements of the* Vita *itself*, about the mysterious lack of certain statements in the *Vita*, respectively! In other words, the problem, clear as daylight, is this: Einhard as an author, more accurately: his psychology. This psychology is a mystery. And this mystery consists of Einhard's grandiose ignorance. Ignorance in terms of dates and things of which the sparrows on the roofs of the Imperial Pfalz were twittering expert tunes. That Einhard was unable to count up to one hundred, may it be forgiven him, in that regard, he is in plenty of good company, since it is well-known that a peculiar illness existed in the Middle Ages which was raging epidemically on top of it: *partial arithmetic brain paralysis*! But surely, Einhard should not have acted so charmingly stupidly that he goes on yammering: despite all conceivable investigations, may God hear my cry, I was able to establish about the time and place of Charles' birth – nothing, nothing at all. That staves in the cask. When Charles was born, really, no astronomers and calendar makers with sextants, no geography professors with atlases, and no watch-makers with chronometers needed to gather around his cradle in order to establish, with a sweat on their brow, in what year and at which place on our planet the remarkable event of the birth of the noble King's son took place. Although Prof. Heimpel reckons that it must have been so, in order for Einhard to find out something in his feverish investigation; sorry, if I, together with countless of my fellow humans, hold a different view.

5. The question of the "material" feasibility of a universal forgery enterprise

More than anything else apparently, Prof. Heimpel does not want to concede the feasibility of a systematic history falsification, because he considers it physically impossible that countless thousands of documents and codices could have been fabricated. This possibility does not want to enter his mind; surely, such a thing goes beyond the humanly possible, because one is to consider, he interjects, all those fabrications had to be furnished with the traces of old age. Prof. Heimpel may rest assured: to artfully furnish paper and parchment with "traces of old age and decomposition" is child's play, for a relevant "expert", at any rate[IV]. On the other hand, has Prof. Heimpel never wondered about the youthful freshness, which so many "thousand year-old" documents have preserved into our times?? Now, with regards to the duration of the falsification campaign, it is a real nonsense to imagine that such enterprise could have been completed in ten to twenty years, and equally as a spare-time exercise. Back then, the curia has worked with a long-term view, which by the way, it always does. For that reason alone, I have always stressed that the humanist action spread across a period of *at least one century*. Regrettably, here is not the place for me to expand in detail on the cause and course of the enterprise; for this, I have to refer to a future book supplement. So, on the shores of the river Tiber, not occasional congregations of ten to twenty forgery associates have taken place, but a continually freshly stocked up *learned army of around a thousand men*, spreading across the individual monasteries and

[IV] A most intriguing piece of information, n'est-ce pas?

miscellaneous forgery branches of the entire Occident, had to stem the gigantic task of re-forging medieval history, led by Rome, *down to the minutest and most insignificant detail*.

And now, my cause is a lost one already? Prof. Heimpel spryly claims just that. Too bad only, that the scientific course of the world, in incomprehensible stubbornness, does not give a hoot for such dictatorial claims. As a historian, Prof. Heimpel should be familiar with this stubbornness. Thus, the scientific course of the world is not influenced by claims, it is much rather subject to forward-driving dynamics of certain fundamental energies. That such energies (basic truths) are indeed extant in my system, should have hit home with some who have read my works, or even only this brief response. I am still all alone in this struggle, under difficult conditions. I am waiting for the first expert who is determined to join my cause. Perhaps, they still live as a student in a German university town; in spirit, I reach my hand out to them.

3. The Historical Mysteries of the World

He who wants to criticise me, must necessarily refute the main proofs established by me, that is, not only one, but all of them. I have already stressed this in the Book *Neue Beweise* (p 17) with added emphasis. My critics, however, as their most favourite path of action, sneak about the bush. I acknowledge that Prof. Heimpel has been somewhat focused on sticking with the subject, and has attempted to attack me where I really stand. One may rest assured that I will not overlook anything that is somehow chiefly connected with the Roman forgery action. The enigma of medieval script and language, too, which is being dangled before me as counter-proof by Franz as well as Heimpel, will yet be led to its solution. What the named critics cannot believe and comprehend at all, will then be established as fact: namely, that the *medieval script and language development*, the way it exists today in the paper tradition, has experienced an *after-the-fact construction*. Then, the *problem of the Runes* will also find its clarification: whether the Rune script is older, or the Latin one. *Then, at long last, the great culture theft committed on the Germans will be revealed*. At this point, I have to leave it at these hints since else, I might be accused of "monstrous claims" again, which I am regrettably unable to prove with just a few sentences. However, that I regularly deliver proof for my claims, this habit, I hope, may have already been noticed on me.

Merely small difficulties, or mysteries of the world?

The historians show a willingness to concede that the "historical" tradition of the Middle Ages offers, here and there, certain "difficulties". However, such small difficulties and cosmetic flaws are incapable of denting their

inherited unshakeable trust in the principal authenticity of the tradition. With playful ease even – mostly – they master them, because, praise the Lord!, the expert scientist suffers no lack of explanation options. When there, once in a while, nine explanations fail, then one still has a tenth, and if need be, twenty more. If no reasonable one succeeds, why, then a nonsensical one will do fine, for example in the case of the partial arithmetic brain paralysis of the medieval notaries, discovered not by me, but by the experts. "Many of these difficulties", Heimpel comforts us, "are solved more easily than Kammeier thinks" – it goes without saying, all one has to do is class the document scribes as semi-idiots. However, "many", Heimpel again dejectedly admits, "will remain mysteries." Finally, after all: medieval "history" *does* host mysteries!

So far, no expert has asked themselves the question whether perhaps the "difficulties" and tradition mysteries, which are not to be denied away, could stand in mutual relations, whether they perhaps carry attributes of a related provenance? The realisation that this is indeed the case, that the difficulties can be summarised in group relations, is one that expert science owes to me. I call these individual "difficulty groups" the *historical mysteries of the world*, because in the world space of tradition of the Middle Ages, they represent the last basic problems. Thus, from a thousand difficulties of medieval document forgeries, *one* big world mystery accumulates.

Which now are the historical mysteries of the world? They are the following: 1. the psychological mystery of the medieval forgers; 2. the psychological mystery of the "real" document scribes; 3. the mystery of the loss statistics of medieval scripts; 4. the mystery of the lack of secular registries and archives; 5. the psychological mystery of the medieval chroniclers; 6. the mystery of medieval legal history; 7. the itinerary mystery.

These mysteries can once again be lumped together to the mystery of the deliberate contradiction, this general characteristic of all of medieval tradition. It shall first be discussed briefly.

The deliberate contradiction as the general characteristic

What this mystery is all about, how the deliberate contradiction pushes itself like a wedge into each "fact", and equally splits it into two or more mutually contradicting parts, on that, one will have to find enlightenment in the *Neue Beweise*. These tactics have been deployed by the forgers with such consequence and shamelessness, that it arouses admiration. We find ourselves placed at the centre of this contradiction procedure with the beautiful text book example that is the table of festive days on pages 55-66. For a period of fifty years, "genuine" sources report to us where the Kings back then supposedly spent the high clerical festive days from 1025 to 1073. Naturally, they can have celebrated the relevant fest only in *one* location. However, our "genuine" source scribes, as "contemporaries", "from own experience", know better: namely, the monstrous thing is, that for *each* of the recorded years, *one* source reports that on Christmas (or Easter), the

King had been in X, while the *other* source announces that, much rather, on that day, the King had stayed in Y! How such fairy tails could have been told by contemporaries, *on that*, my critics should rack their brains for once. I have shown that, and why, with these contrasting statements, no mistakes or accidents by the scribes can be established, but that such contradictions have been introduced to the sources *deliberately*. But my brave critics will hang their heads here, and resignedly concede: these difficulties will always remain a mystery.

Not only *different* sources report deliberately contradictory, but also the *very same* sources show, in their individual scripts, the phenomenon of the deliberate contradiction. Why, one has, as I have already shown previously, fabricated *different reviews* of a work with the express purpose of inserting such contradictions in abundant quantities. Such operation, for example, has been undertaken in two closely related script groups (A I and A II) of the *Saxon World Chronicle*. A I has: "Friderich, des keiser *Friderichs* sun" – A II: "Vrederich, des keiser *Henriches* sun". Oh well, the experts shout, this an excusable accident of A I. Meine Herren, this is incorrect, because this "little accident" turns up in 8 hand-writings of A I, and out of 8 scribes, none should have noticed the enormous blunder?? Because what's more is that A I has erred elsewhere, too, this time, in numbers. A II puts the event to 1218, but A I to 1210. And all scripts of group A I have 1210! But in the same sentence, there is another contradiction between A I and A II. A II has: "inde was da an XXX jar", whilst A I announces: "und waz dar an XXXVII jar". But that we are really dealing with deliberate zig-zag tactics here, is proven by the fact that in reviews B and C a *gap* has been left for the last year digit! Short and sweet, our forgers have, once again, not been quite clear about their cursed year numerals, and so they simply zig-zagged as best as they could, here, too. Eckhardt, in his investigation of these problems, reckons (*Abhandlungen der Gesellsch. D. Wissenschaft z. Göttingen*, Vol. 23, 1931; [*Treatises of the Scientific Society to Göttingen*]), the "accidents" in the scripts of A I are probably to be explained by the fact that they have been copied from a lost (!) original specimen X which supposedly must have been very spoiled (!) by "mistakes and vast gaps". Remarkable: to our experts, a difficulty is already sufficiently "explained" when it is being pushed from point A to point B! For in our case, the mystery is: how did the mistakes end up in the "genuine specimen X"?? Silence on the part of expert science. On this so helpful deus ex machina that is the "lost shared model source X", this indispensable dime fiction of our source researchers, one will have to refer to *The Falsification of German History* for further information.

I will now turn to a brief illustration of the historical mysteries of the world by testing, with each mystery, whenever an opportunity presents itself, the penetrating power of the allegedly "devastating" counter-arguments of my critics.

1. The psychological mystery of the medieval "practical" forgers

According to prevailing presumption, the document forgeries, already previously uncovered so abundantly by research, have supposedly been carried out for directly materialistic motives of the forgers, in the most

varying centuries, and independently from each other. With numerous examples, I have delivered proof – and I can multiply those examples at will – that this previously undoubted presumption is false. The forgeries are much rather learned fabrications from the late medieval forgery headquarters. My process of evidence is based upon the foundation of living experience, which teaches the following: a document forger pursuing practical-actual purposes with their falsifications, will, forced by the nature of the subject, closely follow their genuine model sources in carrying out their forgeries. If this axiom of experience even requires an authoritative "confirmation" at all, I have for this case Ficker's testimony at hand (comp. *Neue Beweise*) For the time being, however, there is unfortunately still an "authority" required to confirm this experience for the majority of diplomatists who have not yet internalised this truism, and who are unwilling to concede it.

My investigations, those which are concerned with the comparison of the forgeries with their "genuine" model sources, have in all cases delivered unexpected results. Namely, it turned out that the forgers have, throughout, ignored parts of their "genuine" model sources *with full deliberation*. Consciously and consistently, these alleged practical forgers have denied certain parts of the model sources at will, and instead, with equal consistency with regards to the script character, have introduced different, outlandish graphic elements. Such procedure cannot, as I have shown irrefutably, be founded upon neglect or absent-mindedness of the forgers, but demands the prerequisite of an alert consciousness, a continually sharp focus, thus revealing purpose! Conscious disrespect, however, against the model sources on the part of the forgers, who pursue practical ends with their falsifications, contradicts all experience. In real life, the forger would with these tactics *consciously and willingly* endanger any success! No normal human acts like that. Now, according to the opinion of the document researchers, however, the medieval forgers have supposedly practised these betrayal tactics of the conscious deviation from the model sources *almost consistently*. Thus, these people have falsely attributed to them a state of mind, which – comprehensively as a general phenomenon – according to all experience that we gather in these things on a daily basis, is a fiction. From which follows: the forgeries in question can only be "learned" fabrications. At length and width I have explained (*Neue Beweise*) that, and why, simply the mere existence of such makings betrays their learned origin.

My critics, who allegedly discover with me exclusively mere nonsensical claims, must not blame me, when I retort with equal currency: the idea which they, much like their expert colleagues per se, have formed here on the psychology of humans with a regular disposition, is truly a nonsensical one. In order to understand this, we need not be in possession of vast expert knowledge; to the contrary, here, the else so useful knowledge prevents the right insight. Every amateur who has openly looked into life, may on this point judge more accurately than the in prejudices entangled expert. Here, the living experience is crucial alone, not paper knowledge.

But it may also be that, on the one hand, the right insight could be extant with the expert scientists, but that it were in a struggle with another realisation. Namely, the embarrassing realisation that even the slightest hint at agreement with this partial result of my investigation would amount to the avowal that a universal

history falsification enterprise has indeed taken place. This avowal however – for the time being at least – is being wrestled tooth and nail.

2. If the paper tradition of the Middle Ages were a historical reality, then the second historical mystery consists of the remarkable psychology of the medieval "genuine" document scribes.

In countless diplomas which, on the basis of the usual relative method, must be considered "indubitably genuine", research has established conspicuous errors with, for example, the date entries. Such downright monstrous boners in the dating stem, as the researchers report, not perhaps from accidents of the chancery civil servants, i.e. they are not writing mistakes committed from flightiness. Much rather, one has made the quite amazing discovery that the cause of such unbelievable dating errors were to be found in a quite peculiar *mental inferiority* of the notaries of those times. With these chancerists[V], one has discovered a new illness, which can be most pointedly characterised by the diagnosis: partial arithmetic brain paralysis. Note well; not I have discovered this affliction, but the document researchers; I have merely given this illness its name. According to the reports of the experts, this illness, in the Middle Ages, did not occur sporadically, but was rather raging epidemically. Almost exclusively afflicted by it were notaries and chancerists. A cure for it did unfortunately not exist. In the afflicted, how did this ailment make itself known?

In order to explain it briefly: the document scribes, otherwise humans with a completely normal disposition, highly educated in schools by standards of knowledge back then, were suddenly, at the moment they were wanting to put a date entry under a diploma, unable to correctly count from 1 up to 100! So, it is not that they had to master complicated mathematical tasks! No, not, never at all. They only had to develop as much arithmetic mental activity that they could endeavour on working out which number might follow 12, for example. And that, they could not manage!! That is, in the chancery, they could not manage to do this! Despite them being, as mentioned, folks who have also enjoyed maths lessons at school. Naturally, not differentials, but that which is generally called elementary art of calculation. That which the children learn in year one at school. So, again: the most basic of the most elementary in calculating, these pitiable chancerists did not master – when they were required to make date entries. Yet, the most wondrous still is, that these folks, outside the chancery, for example when shopping in the marketplace, or when drawing their salaries, were yet again able to calculate correctly from 1 up to 100, and even beyond. Because, as mentioned, this illness was somehow related to those blasted diplomas.

The reader is not to grow angry with me now, and to believe that I am having fun with them. Be that far from me. After all, it was not me who has made these wondrous discoveries, but the expert diplomatists. They all witness it, that these notaries have "indeed" suffered from this peculiar arithmetic disease. Let us hear, for example, P Kehr: "I believe that [this chancerist in the chancery of Ludwig the German; K.]

[V] Perhaps I shouldn't be doing this, but I am applying German new-word-creation procedures here, much like the original does with 'Kanzlist'.

Heberhard… has not been able to count up to 40." Or let us listen to Breßlau: "And as striking as the fact is that a man [the notary GB; Kamm.]… could not manage such simple arithmetic operations, the way the correct calculation of years of reign had required – for the counting, the fingers of both hands were sufficient – we have to accept this fact as unshakeable." (more on this in *The Falsification of German History*, Book 1) So, there, the authorities tell us: the chancerists were unable to correctly count from 1 up to 20 or 40! Who here would muster up the courage to doubt such stupidity? Besides the fact that the historians can badly stomach any doubt at all, they document: we have to accept this fact as unshakeable!

I was the first to dare doubt this semi-idiocy of medieval document scribes. The punishment has not been far afoot. I am portrayed as a man who pollutes the world only with "nonsensical claims"! In view of such bad testimony, some would stand in the corner, ashamed. Not me. Because I know that it is not important what the experts of today, for this or that obvious reason, think about my results, but what judgement expert science will pass in ten or thirty years. What the verdict will then be, I do not doubt, under the condition that even then, the truth is more valuable than the lie, and that will be the case for as long as there are Germans in the world. This mystery of the world, too, is not being solved with expert knowledge made of paper, but with realisation and life experience.

3. The mystery of the loss statistics of medieval scripts

So far, my critics have remarkably shyly circumnavigated this mystery at a great distance. They will know themselves, why [they have done so]?

Let us suppose for a moment that the paper tradition is at least by and large the result of historical events, then of course, a statistic of the lost medieval scripts should show, with regards to preserved and lost ones, respectively, the *characteristic of chance – blind workings*. Nobody will doubt this, unless they are expert historical scientists of yesteryear and nowadays. In equal measure, undistinguished, script originals as well as copies should have fallen to disappearance over the course of many centuries.

The expert scientists however, have made a strange discovery. Namely, a checking through the preserved stock of literary historical sources has established the result that the *originals* (original scripts, archetypes) of almost all significant chronicles are missing, and that furthermore, of the countless copies, equally regularly, those specimen have gone missing that are denoted by the term "*shared model source*" by historians. Thus, with other words: it has turned out that the else so blind chance has been cherry-picking with puzzling accuracy and consistency!! Almost still more remarkably than with the originals, this unique "chance" phenomenon comes across with the so-called shared model sources. (In *The Falsification of German History*, the reader can learn some more on this.)

Nobody believes in such systematic cherry-picking works of chance. Only the nowadays historians believe with downright childlike innocence, or better, bias, in this fairy tale – because they are forced to

believe it. If they were only to start doubting a little, disaster would strike: the realisation that an enormous action has systematically sieved though the sources. Unfortunately, however, the fact of a systematic history falsification action could then no longer be denied.

I have caught the historians in a noose here, from which there is no escape for them anymore. They will wriggle for a while yet. Finally, even they will realise that it is quite silly wanting to defend themselves against reason and experience with unfit means. I whole-heartedly invite the source researchers to pull all their stops of critique, in order to prove to me that I, with my explanation on the so-called shared model sources, am "on a stray path". I will then not fail, with regards to their famous script family trees, to give them an answer which will noticeably dampen their enthusiasm for further critique on this subject.

4. The mystery of the comprehensive lack of secular registries and archives

Following the findings of the tradition, whilst the Roman curia, since the earliest times, both maintained registries and established archives, whilst even all *clerical* institutions per se had at least archives from the outset, the *secular*, especially the German rulers, could allegedly be convinced of the importance, nay, indispensability, of these administrative institutions only very late. Besides some early attempts in the 13th century, registries were maintained only in Henry VII.'s chancery. Even the historians have to admit that such state of affairs is highly alienating, but they know how to comfort themselves, because "history" just proves that is was so. One has to put their trust in the tradition, the experts reassure us, where would we end up if we started doubting? Alas now, there are humans, I also belong to them, who see in the paper tradition not dogmas which must not be doubted. After all of course, reason is in the world so that it may be used. Let us just go ahead, and apply it accordingly to the findings to be discussed here.

There is one thing certain: if the secular Firsts, almost throughout all the medieval centuries, equally principally ignored the for an orderly administration indispensable registry maintenance and installation of archives, then that would mean: these Kings have, one and all, been mentally dull. The big opponent of course, the curia, had cultivated those institutions since the oldest days, and not to kill time, either, but to constantly afflict bad wounds to the Kings! If the Kings and Emperors never parried such strikes, we cannot help ourselves, we have to consider them childish fools and flatheads. According to everything else "history" is reporting to us on these rulers, they were no blockheads at all! Here, the "facts" of the tradition contradict each other!

In his critique, there is another thing with which Heimpel has also confronted me: "that *secular registries and archives* had not existed, is not correct; we know fragments [!; K.] of the registry of Frederic II., Henry VII., Ludwig the Bavarian, Charles IV. etc." One or the other reader was stunned perplexed when they read the sentence in all its "devastating" power of penetration. This, Heimpel's artful statement, can be taken in the way that I had, once again, put out into the world the plentifully known nonsensical claim of the comprehensive lack of secular registries. I have now, and Heimpel admits it as well, not at all denied that

indeed, towards the *end* of the Middle Ages, secular registries had also been maintained. However, what I have pointed out with emphasis, which is also crucial, namely our fourth world mystery, is this: how could it have come to pass that the curia already so early, but the secular rulers *only so late* realised the enormous importance of registry maintenance? The problem: how come that *before* the year 1240 (in the Imperial chancery only in the 14th century!), we hear nothing of secular registry maintenance, whilst the curia had already cultivated this indispensable administrative custom for long centuries?

On this world mystery, Heimpel should have aired the word of deliverance. Indeed, he takes a run-up to the solution, but alas, the plan fails once more. With bouncing steps, he sets out jumping over the bar of critique as follows: the laymen (i.e. here, the Kings) were "despite all knightly culture, for the largest part illiterates." Now, suppose for all I care, which is of course not true, that they had been illiterates with all their knightly culture. But now, attention! What? *Were the Kings perhaps supposed to have written the registries themselves*?? Did they not have, for that purpose, their highly educated clerical chancellors and notaries? Even my critic cannot doubt this, and with that, he does not jump over the bar, but flat against it. Only a word of such illiterate King: make me a registry, the way the curia does! And there, even in Germany, registries would have been maintained early enough, just like in Rome. By which it thus becomes obvious: in this category of critique, too, my critic has merely punched air.

5. The psychological mystery of the medieval chronicle, necrology and registry scribes

If a universal history falsification enterprise has taken place, which can already not at all be doubted anymore, then there must, it goes without saying, besides the diplomatical, the *literary* series of the medieval sources be forged from the ground up, too. So, then, the stock of this literary source genre (chronicles) as well, must show certain characteristic attributes that betray the artificial birth. That is the case to a most prominent degree. Such qualifying attributes of betrayal consist of, for example, contradictions of the sources amongst each other, that is, consciously introduced *deliberate* contradictions. I have abundantly listed examples of these tactics in *The Falsification of German History*. Traditional critique, of course, regards, free of suspicion, such offences and contradictions as merely easily excusable mistakes and accidents, which were to be blamed on the flightiness and thoughtlessness of the copyists. Such explanations, in their indefinite generalisation, sound quite acceptable, and it would not occur to me to demand of the medieval copyists that they should never err, or should never work inattentively. Erring was, even in the Middle Ages, quite human. But if we now look at these individual cases of "erring" under the magnifier of critique, we then make almost exclusively the discovery that no error or accident is to be found, but that the chronicler reports contradictive, and apparently, even nonsensical things with blatant purpose.

Don't forget, the historians shout at me, that many such mistakes and contradictions are to be explained with the *biased (party) standpoint* of the chronicle writers. Nothing seems more evident than this explanation. A party writer can indeed, from his love for his hero or for a certain cause, modify events, but the historians

are forgetting that such modifications, in real life, have their limits! Indeed, such a party writer knows the art of turning a defeat into half a victory, or even a full victory, and of painting the character traits of the opposition in colours blacker than black. But a party writer who treats on events of *their* time, i.e. events well-known to all of their contemporaries, will be careful for example, to arbitrarily transfer the location of a well-known battle from bias, or even to pluck from thin air an allegedly significant contemporary event. With such manipulations, they would not further their cause, but damage it, and make themselves a laughing stock on top of it. So, the modification of events, by a party writer, in real life, has its limits! In the *forged tradition* of course, the alleged party man does not need to respect those limits; here, they can serve up to their co-world the porkiest lies and fairy tales. In the shadow empire of poetry, no "human" takes offence by it!

So, we are to note well: with the chronicle writers, it is all about the reported specific individual case. Each one of them has to be examined, whether they are really based upon "accident" or purpose. With commonplace nullities such as: this author just loves working "inattentively", nothing is gained.

Wondrous, nay, magical things happen with the medieval folks when they write chronicles. Erring is, as mentioned, as human as eating and drinking are. Supposedly, two humans who were chronicle scribes at the same time as being humans, namely Nithard and the so-called Astronomus, have allegedly lived on our planet during the times of Ludwig the Pious. Both contemporaries report in their works also on Ludwig's lifespan. The contemporary Nithard has the misfortune that he "errs" on the number of years of Ludwig's life. Why shouldn't he have made a mistake once, the historians calm us down. So, Nithard erred when he, instead of the correct 62 years of life, attested to 64 years of Ludwig's life. But now, the magical miracle takes place: namely from sympathy, the contemporary Astronomus also "errs" with the exactly *same result*! He, too, reports wrongly: 64 years of Ludwig! Two contemporaries err *concurrently*. We are almost led to presume, such contemporaries were picking up the scent of other folks' mistakes. This Astronomus erred on yet another occasion. A congregation of bishops to Aachen, he places in the year 837; but it belongs "correctly" to the year 836. Another one, this time "the else so accurate Prudentius", magically picks up the scent and makes the same mistake "of placing this synod a year too late". (See Meyer von Knonau, *Nithards vier Bücher Geschichten*, 1866, footnote 73; [*Nithard's Four Books of Stories*]) So, this is what the little, innocent mistakes of medieval chroniclers look like, viewed under light.

On the dangerously close to insanity bordering mental state of the *necrology scribes*, we want to keep it short here. These people were in the habit of writing down in their death books the days of death of their abbots etc., in order to remember them on the return of that day in their prayers. Now, just how did they make their entries? "Particularly frequent is it, that the names are entered a day before or after the day of death, not rarely are they also misplaced by a week, a month." I cannot help myself and have to declare: truly, such misplacement of names is craziness. I am permitted to declare this with a calm conscience, because experts have even made the discovery that there are also erroneous entries in the death books, "which appear to have

been made quite arbitrarily". Here, our experts have the boundless nerve of talking of the "inattentiveness of the writers". Let us turn away from such inexperience in the ways of the world!

An equally failed explanation attempt of Heimpel forces me to deal a little with the medieval *registry scribes*. Namely, Heimpel reckons that many mistakes and gaps in the registries (of the popes) were to find sufficient explanation in the fact that the entries were performed by *concepts*. When I admit that I was smirking about this "explanation", the reader may not find this easily understandable, perhaps not my critic, either. The registry experts however, understand me very well here. Because they are caught in a fight ever more viciously unfolding under the banner: here concept – there original! That is, "on the question whether with this or that registry volume, or partial registry, respectively, the entries have now been performed by the concept or the original, they are in disagreement like cat and dog." If the one specialist "proves": here, the entries have been made by concepts, the other one moves up with the "proof": au contraire, these entries have been made by the originals! The strange thing in this affair is that both parties are right, but only ever to 50 percent. Like I said, I had to smirk when I first looked at Heimpel's explanation via the concept idea. He has thus swiftly "decided" the viciously fought struggle by the supremacy of his own power on behalf of the one side. With other words: my critic explains a problem by it being – problematic.

6. The mystery of the medieval legal history

This historical world mystery is one of the most interesting, but at the same time, also one of the uncanniest. In order to fully understand this, the reader will have to thoughtfully read through the relevant chapter of *The Falsification of German History*, and particularly dive into the "legally mute" centuries. Perhaps twenty years ago, the medieval legal history has suddenly revealed itself to the researchers to be a dangerous powder keg. In the Franconian estate of the legal structure, an enormous explosion has taken place back then, so that the legal scientists flew from the scene in horror, and ever since, they've been staring at the pile of rubble from afar in grief. Krusch, in his *Neue Forschungen über die drei oberdeutschen Leges: Bajuwariorum, Alamannorum, Ribuariorum* (*Abhandlungen der Gesellsch. d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, New Series, Vol. 20, 1927) [*New Research on the three Upper German*…], intensely illustrates to us the state of affairs on ground zero: "Babylonian confusion of methods" is to be blamed for the explosion. Viewed superficially, this is correct, but the researchers have forgotten to ask themselves what the internal and innermost reasons are. The explosion was triggered by self-ignition simply because these laws, the way they are preserved in the scripts today, represent badly botched artificial fabrications from the big forgers' workshop. Indeed, the medieval legal history has had it. No historical Doctor Ironbeard is capable of helping this patient back to its feet. Amongst the learned experts, one does not want to accept this, but just a little patience: the realisation will not be inhibited for all that long anymore.

Just how does Krusch judge some of the experts on legal history? "Anyhow, one can have their fun, how Beyerle, from the top of his head, and without any realistic basis, continually keeps spinning the thread,

always heaping one mistake on top of the other". (ibid, p 70) Or: "On Sohm's edition of the *Lex Ribuariorum*, I had to speak out the devastating verdict that everything he had written on the origin of the *Lex*, decomposes into a nothing." (ibid, p 142) The state of the legal history is desperate, because the foundation Krusch has brick-layered, will also collapse onto itself, as soon as it is knocked with the critical hammer of the absolute method. It is not to be expected any other way at all, because these laws are forged, and in quite obvious fashion at that.

For a long investigation, the necessary room is not available here, so I limit myself to revealing just *one* "brilliant" forgery trick.

In the scripts, there exist two versions of law, of the Lex Alamannorum: the *Hlotariana* and the *Lantfridana*, whose contents roughly (!) concur. "One carries the name of the Franconian King Chlothar at the top, and is the product of a Franconian Imperial congregation, the other is that of the Alamannian Duke Lantfrid… and has been promoted to a decree by an Alamannian tribal congregation." (Krusch, ibid, p 107) We notice here that these "two" laws "roughly concur in their content", but are supposed to have *two* legislators. Guild legal research, quite opposed to the above opinion of Krusch, had presumed both laws, simply because they concur, to be *one*, and that this *one* law therefore "could have only one legislator, of course". *Either* Chlothar *or* Lantfrid!

Indeed, there's the rub. We are dealing with one and the same fabrication from the forgery action, only, the forgers were, with this fabrication, not clear for various reasons which of the two rulers (Chlothar or Lantfrid) should be the originator of the law. They had to zig-zag again, and again, they resorted to the proven tactics of veiling and deliberate contradiction. But this time, in one place, they have gone about it so obviously, that a blind person could feel the intent with a stick: *they have thrown Chlothar and Lantfrid together in one pot*! They have created a person with two faces! They have created a mythical double-being! And they have done this as follows:

Script A 9 shows four likenesses of persons. (See facsimile on fig. 8 at the end of the above quoted article by Krusch.) Below it, top left, a pathetically drawn figure, furnished with an inscription next to it: *Lodh : anrirex dux Alamannorum*. This inscription is a muddle, mixed together out of 'Chlotarius rex' and 'Lantfrid dux Alamannorum'. The figure in question thus represents the double-person Lodhanri = Chlothar *and* Lantfrid. The deliberate contradiction, this time as a picture! 'May the reader of this script find out for themselves later who I am referring to with this Lodhanri', thought the clever drawing artist. Krusch reckons, "the long, gently flowing down hair already reveals that the painter wanted to illustrate the King and not perhaps the Alamannian Duke. So, the extension "dux Alamannorum" in the inscription is the bad interpolation of a scribe…" A very bad "interpolation", indeed! But the "interpolator" has not at all just added the extension 'dux Alamannorum', the way Krusch would have us believe, he has, already from the start, muddled about, namely Chlothar and Lantfrid into the nonsense Lodhanri! That this is not perhaps a case of

"accident", but applied purpose, is witnessed on top of it by one place in the text of this script. Namely here, in the text, it also says: 'temporibus Lodhanri rege'. That is, once again the double person Lodhanri.

7. The itinerary mystery

That the many inconsistencies of the so-called Kings' itineraries are not perhaps merely easily improved cosmetic flaws, but that they get knotted up into a historical [truly hysterical, too] mystery of the world, this realisation has given the historians a great surprise and embarrassment. They resist the by me introduced solution to this mystery with all their might, for they, of course, know all too well, what the acknowledgement of my solution would mean with regards to the true nature of medieval "history". Just by what tale the mystery is hanging with the itineraries, on that, the reader can find enlightenment in the *Neue Beweise*. At this point, only several of my critics' comments on the itinerary problem, not exactly testifying to deep insight, shall be dispatched.

We have all learned at school, that the medieval Emperors and Kings, on their steeds, constantly travelled through the lands, that they were underway on an eternal tramp from town to town, from palace to palace. Why this eternal wandering of the kings in the Middle Ages? On that, too, we were enlightened at school: the rulers had *no permanent residence*, we were told. That made sense. He who has no permanent residence, must be on a tramp, whether they like it or not, we told ourselves. We were therefore satisfied, but in our satisfaction, we failed to notice that the central question of the whole problem had to yet be posed and to be answered. Namely the question: why then did these rulers have no permanent residence throughout the entire Middle Ages?? No history professor has ever asked themselves that question. Why ponder? Why, "history" has taught that this was "indeed" the case in the Middle Ages.

In *Neue Beweise*, I have shown that this alleged fact of the lack of a permanent residence, and thus, by proxy, a steady estate, is a fairy tale. It goes without saying that this fairy tale originates with the late medieval forgery headquarters, but it was not thought up for the edification of later generations, but because of force by necessity. For more than one forgery-tactical reason, the medieval Emperors and Kings *had to* be sent on an eternal tramp. Thank God, this time, the forgers had to, pressed by the delicate nature of the affair, deploy a modus operandi that was so obvious and so clumsy, that it quite betrays itself at a first critical glance. This time, they have employed the deliberate contradiction so obviously that the above in this Book mentioned festive day table alone, for example, reveals the whole swindle of their itineraries most delightfully. With this, the result of my investigation is quite rightfully this: the "historical fact" of the eternal wanderings of the Kings, their lack of residence as well as the flying Imperial government per se, during all medieval centuries is a lie. In truth, the rulers of the Middle Ages have also had a permanent residence, and thus a steady estate. (Naturally, they undertook travels, too!)

When my critic Heimpel had read *that*, at first, these words: "thus, the nonsense is made the method here yet", left his mouth, but then, he became cheerful: "In a castle that has remained unknown to us,

Kammeier's King sits in the middle of a guaranteed genuine registry." This thought amused him so, that he wanted to roll around laughing. The King in a permanent residence?! Such nonsense has never been thought up by any human. Directly unnatural, such thought! A medieval ruler with a permanent residence?! The Rhein would sooner flow upwards, towards the Alps.

We should actually not disturb a cheerful person joyfully laughing, so I will only briefly interrupt my critic, so he can carry on laughing. It occurred to me that back then, in the residence-less Middle Ages, there lived a category of rulers, namely the *Roman popes*, who were "quite naturally, it goes without saying", constantly in the process of wandering!! Or should I perhaps be getting this wrong?? Noisily, the laugh of my critic resounds anew. The popes without a permanent residence? The curia on an tramp ongoingly!! No human brain has cooked up such nonsense. Thus, the nonsense is made the method here yet, Heimpel shouts. The popes on a tramp – ha! ha! Anyhow, we now want to leave the cheerfulness of the critic to its course, and in the meantime, seriously think this state of affairs over once.

So: *what Heimpel finds so natural with the popes, he finds unnatural with the Emperors and Kings*! My most devout respect before this logical dualism (to not use a more fitting term). When especially the popes would have had thousandfold cause to constantly ride from church to church, from monastery to monastery, because as is widely known, not only were there daily arguments between the clerics to be reconciled, but every ten years or so, a number of monasteries had to be "reformed" as well. Thus, work aplenty for the wandering pope. But look at this: the popes had their permanent residence – in Rome and Avignon, respectively. And they knew why such permanent residence (government) was practical, and for what it was useful. The Emperors and Kings, once again, did not realise such things, they simply were – illiterates and flatheads! This is the most wondrous thing: during the entire Middle Ages, reason had set up camp beyond the Alps in Rome. Elsewhere in Europe, absurdity kept the field. Let us join the historians in bowing our heads to this "fact".

However, I cannot deny that by now, I and many of my readers are in a most cheerful mood. After all, we owe to my critics the valuable realisation that my results are unimpeachable and irrefutable. Although Heimpel was still talking of nonsense, a more recent critic has already picked up that I deliver "half truths", nonetheless. (In *Literarisches Zentralblatt* 1936, p 656, [*Literary Central Paper*]) Thus I am permitted to muster some courage. Just a little patience; sooner or later, the half truths will reveal themselves as full, round truth.

Book 2

[originally published as Book 13 of the Serial *Völkisches Erwachen*/*Folkish Awakening*]

Mystery Rome in the Middle Ages

by Wilhelm Kammeier

1937

Adolf Klein Verlag, Leipzig C 1

Printed by Buchdruckerei [Book Printers] H Eschenbacher, Leipzig

Introduction: Humanism as the stage for the forgery enterprise

The herewith presented Book [no. 13] offers the continuation of my previous works on the late medieval universal falsification action. (1. *The Falsification of German History*; *New Proofs for the Falsification of German History*; *The Historical Mysteries of the World*. All three published by the Verlag [Publisher] Adolf Klein, Leipzig.)

My conduct of evidence, which is based upon unconditionally safe foundations, namely, the absolute method, has not failed to convince many of the readers of my writings of the fact that at the end of the Middle Ages, a massive history falsification action has taken place. The many historical mysteries of the world in the realm of medieval tradition all find *one* solution only: just this very fact of the falsification action. The history of all medieval centuries has been systematically, and from the ground up, re-forged by Rome; over this result of my investigations, many readers now no longer have any doubts. However, a very important and burning question now stands unanswered before my readers – yet. *It is the question for the root cause of that Roman action*. Such a monstrous forgery undertaking naturally has to have an ultimately imperative root cause. Reasons of the grave kind must have been present when Rome decided on carrying out that exceedingly expensive and difficult undertaking. For that enormous action, an enormous cause must have been in effect as a triggering momentum. But what was the root cause? Is it even possible at all to establish the motives for that action? Are we perhaps permitted to presume to discover the sought after reasons by the traces, which the activity of the forgers has left behind in the newly fabricated tradition, despite all care having been taken? In order to answer all these questions, the author carries out investigations, the results of which are presented in this Book.

Not only the root cause of the action lies hidden under a thick veil, the action itself as well unfolded in the shadows of a very skilfully constructed scenery. "The universal history falsification action parades in the mask of the spiritual movement that we have given the name humanism (Renaissance). Both movements (falsification action and Renaissance) are one!" With this formula, I have, in my Volume *The Falsification of German History*, for the there mentioned reasons, placed the point in time of the action to the threshold of modern times, and at the same time, stigmatised the so-called humanist movement, which acts as the public appearance, as the harmless scenery of the forgery drama. In the long train of the humanist generations of the 15th century, the hooded players of the drama: the leaders, the organisers and helping hands, the knowing, and the ignorant helpers' helpers, move past before our eyes. Humanism is not, as it appears to be, a contemplative affair inside the late medieval study chambers, not merely a learned subject of world-forgotten book and science enthusiasts, but much rather, humanism is, by its origin and by its objective, a prominent church and profane political movement. Humanism represents the attempt of erecting a world-political system, namely the Roman hierarchy, upon the foundation of paper and ink. It represents the attempt of feeding and maintaining a mental organism, namely the church, with ink instead of living heart-blood. And this insane

attempt has succeeded! But how can it be possible that paper and ink play the steady foundation and the ideological power station of a spiritual world power? The monstrous becomes possible by presenting parchment and ink in the form of "history". "History" and "handed-down tradition" as sanctified "traditions" are the wondrous source from which the Rome church recruits its vitality. However, history has to have the attribute of "handed down tradition", and this tradition has to proclaim quite certain tendencies, else history and tradition are of no use. Once, one could use only a history which would prove something, which would prove quite certain facts, teachings and views. A history, a past that would *not* prove what was required, but perhaps prove the opposite or something otherwise disadvantageous, was no good for the forgery associates. Now, if the past was presenting itself to be neutral, cry to God, or even obstinate, it had then to be taken into correction; it had to be worked over and clipped so, that it would truly "prove" just what was to be proven by its aid in the first place. Rome needed the history for its theology; and since the true history of the Middle Ages turned out to be exceedingly useless for the pursued purposes, it had to be erased offhand, and replaced by a "tradition" that would most obediently follow the posed demands. History became the maiden of theology, yes, it turned itself theology. The fact of the matter can also be branded with the vice versa formula: *theology is history*!

With this formula now, we have already hinted at the hidden root cause of the history falsification action. From a distance afar, we sense indications that this root cause keeps equally slumbering on, in the nature, and the core, of the Roman church. Just how this is to be understood, the explanations of this Book will clarify.

1. The religious-psychological mystery of the Babylonian exile of the church

Why has the history of the Middle Ages been falsified? If, as a historical researcher, I were a relativist, I would now, in order to detect the hidden root cause of the action, go on a hunt for [paper] records. What is not written in the records, does, as is well-known, not exist as a historical fact – say the historians. This is even true, namely with regards to real (unadulterated) history. However, in the realm of tradition of the falsified medieval history, this statement loses its validity; in the districts of falsified history, different rules apply, different measures are required in order to find the truth. Because the nature of falsified history makes itself known by just that very fact that the "records" are forged. Wanting to assume, on top of it, unearthing nicely designed individual records in the archives, about the most secret of secret facts of the history falsification action, i.e. the *root cause* of the enterprise, would be conceived plenty naively. Thus, a proof by records is

outright disqualified for our subject. In the face of such fatal state of affairs, the relativistic historians will shrug their shoulders, put their hands in their laps resignedly, and reassure us: in this case, there is nothing that can be done; without a basis of records, any search for the root cause of the action is hopeless.

Now, it is clear indeed: a basis for the investigation must exist. Quite without foundation, in free air, only phantasy can go for a walk; the critical spirit, however, must have firm ground under its feet. My examinations into the root cause of the action must also act, somewhere, somehow, on the level of an objectively given reality. May the historians, always most willingly, also confront me with my allegedly "monstrous claims", I can assure them – should they not yet have noticed it themselves – that my thinking works at least as critically and inexorably objectively as theirs. In their absolute novelty, my claims may sound monstrous to some ears, but one may rest assured that I do not establish any result that has not gone through the fire of the toughest critique. Although the relativists act as if, in the oven of their regular relative critique, there was an incredibly hot "critical" heat, which lets all unauthentic elements of the historical examination material melt away, this critical heat sensation is nonetheless based, as I have shown, upon pure imagination. He who wants to separate the authentic from the unauthentic, will necessarily have to wave goodbye to the blind relative critique, and deploy the absolute method. This method, whose nature, as is well-known, rests in the confrontation of the historical material with the living experience, will also be deployed in the following investigations.

It has been said above: we are hard pushed to unearth records that could deliver clarity on the root cause of the falsification action. There are nonetheless sufficient opportunities to track down the deeply hidden root cause: these opportunities are found in the mass of sources of the falsified tradition. *Since the falsification action has taken place, temporally, in the epoch of around 14-1500, the root causes of the action must have been in effect, temporally, immediately before the action. That means that the root causes must be found in the (falsified) history, from as early as around 1300 onwards*. My task thus consists of setting the searchlight of the absolute critique to the history around the year 1300.

According to a statement in the sources, a church-political event of unique significance fell into the first decade of the 14th century. Something remarkable and monstrous happened in Christianity: namely, one day, the papal chair in the christian world capital city Rome stood empty! It stood empty a year on, and even remained empty for years, nay, throughout decades. What had happened? Was there no governor of Christ, no successor to the first of apostles, Peter, no pope anymore? Peculiarly, there really still was a pope. But Christendom now saw the pope reside far off of the eternal Rome, in a Southern French town, in *Avignon*. What had happened? What has caused this change of the papal residence? Imagine that: the *Roman* bishop in the French town of Avignon! Was such a thing even conceivable? For God's sake, you Christian folks, just what had happened? But let us go and just ask the historians for the cause of the sensational papal home move.

The historians patronise us: the pope elected on 5th July 1305, Clemens V., is to blame for the shift of the papal residence from Rome to Avignon. Clemens was a born Frenchman. "The elected, who was on a visitation journey [as archbishop of Bordeaux; K.], has accepted the election; however, instead of following the electors' wish to go to Italy, he summoned them [namely the cardinals; K.] to Lyon for his coronation… After the coronation, the pope decided not to travel to Italy, but to remain in France. With that, the time of the *residence of the popes in France* had begun, the seventy-year exile, the Babylonian prisoner-ship of the successors of Peter…"[1] So, Clemens was not willing to travel to Rome. Why not? "From fear of the Italian party formations, and from a preference for France." Fear and preference – for so momentous a decision such as the cancellation of Rome as a residence for the popes, a rather lame motivation. This is what the historians reckon as well. Therefore, one has researched for "deeper lying" motives, and discovered such in the sphere of power of the then French monarchy. King Philipp IV. of France, dubbed The Handsome, has, during the entire turnover, supposedly stood as the driving force behind Clemens V.. This smart King knew how to influence Clemens to set up camp in Avignon in 1309. So, the bottom line is that profane use of trickery and force have brought on the Babylonian exile of the church.

That the affair of the change of residence has supposedly taken place in that way, the historians know from the study of the contemporary sources. One contemporary of the event, for example, is Giovanni Villani; on the happenings before and during the election of Clemens V., he has given us most graphic and detailed descriptions, about which one can follow up in A von Reumont's history of the town Rome[2]. For the readers of my previous writings, it means no surprise at all anymore, when they hear the following with regards to this description of the contemporary Villani: "There is no reason to doubt that Giovanni Villani wrote what the volk believed back then, and just how the government of Clemens V. as well as his proven fatal weakness against Philipp the Handsome seemed to confirm. However, there can be no doubt that the story, at least in its main parts (!), is invented." (R., p. 719.) So, our Villani has plucked much, and especially the main things, from thin air, or had the older population from the broad public prompt him, respectively; only on the least significant things was he able to hunt down the truth by chance! The reader knows such helpless "contemporaries" from my previous writings abundantly. Naturally, in this case, there are still other sources as well, which report differently, namely records. My reader also knows the reason for this phenomenon of the double-entry book-keeping in the forged medieval sources: the use of the deliberate contradiction.

Rome was without a pope. From 1309 until 1377, the small Southern French town of Avignon enjoyed the honour of being the residence of the popes. This "historical fact" of the so-called exile of the church shall now be subjected to a critical view for one particular aspect. Not any of the thousand random incidental questions and circumstances shall be placed at the centre of the critical attention, but the event of the Babylonian exile as such shall be assessed. When the relativistic history researchers have finished their repair work on the fragments of the falsified tradition, when they believe to have accomplished this reason-breaking feat of distilling the relevant historical essence of truth out of a thousand pieces of mutually contradicting

information from different sources, when they contentedly put to the side their pseudo-critical gear – then, *my* critical operations are only just beginning. So, the historians declare: the Babylonian exile of the church is an indubitably historical factum; however, with a *factum*, we will have to calm down ourselves, as well as our critical suspicion. The exile of the church is a factum established by sources, and thus, as a factum, is sacrosanct for any further critique. However, this factum now falls into the environment of the *falsified* tradition, which, as is well-known, stretches to the threshold of modern times. On the territory of falsified tradition however, the critical probe must dive into the innermost marrow of a "factum". To me, the factum of the Babylonian exile – because it is at home in the district of falsified history – means, for the time being, merely a paper affair, something in writing. One may collect a mountain of "records" for me, then point out: this mountain of records is the witness to the factum of the Babylonian exile – since I know that I am on the territory of falsified tradition – even a Gaurisankar [Mt. Everest] of written paper will, for the time being, fail to impress me. Certainly: paper and ink represent the objective body, the vessel of a historical factum; but much more than in this husk, I am interested in its contents, the spiritual core, namely, the factum itself! With a "historical factum", I am primarily interested in its *attribute as a partition of previous living experience*. The factum makes out to be part of previous living experience – whether rightfully or wrongly, that is the question here! That is *my* question.

I would like to put it this way: it is the *soul* of a factum that interests me. It is not the outer secular, but the spiritual half of the factum that occupies me. The factum of the Babylonian exile of the church, too, I do not examine – primarily – as a worldly event, but with regards to its spiritual foundation. More accurately: with regards to the *psychology of the people making this factum a reality*. So, this time, we will not deploy psychology of the individual, but, broadly spoken, mass psychology; religious psychology of an era is deployed.

My question, however, is this: *was popedom's Babylonian exile religious-psychologically possible*?

If I look at the "historical event" of the Babylonian exile long and hard, I have to admit: this event is one singular big religious-psychological mystery to me. So, the residence of the chief herdsman of Christendom had been shifted from Rome to some other place. Conceded, political tools of power and intrigue could have *forced* a shift of the papal residence away from its "hereditary seat" – but how is it explained that the resulting "unnatural" state of affairs did not spontaneously cancel itself out, when its root cause, the forced situation, disappeared? Anyway, was even the first exile pope, Clemens V., in such a forced situation, that he could not have left French soil in any case, even if he had wanted to? The historians do not agree with this view at all, either. That Clemens and his Avignonian successors had been forcefully "kept as prisoners", no modern day history researcher makes indeed that claim. However, quite beside Clemens V., how is it explained that the succeeding popes, too, did not immediately return to Rome, when there was really no talk at all anymore that brute force kept them banned in Avignon? The popes could have left Avignon at any time – if they had only wanted to. Then why did they not return to Rome? Consider, one accuses me, the popes

succeeding Clemens were also *Frenchmen* by birth. So, it is surely understandable, one assures me, that French popes, even without being kept back by force, felt no right cause to turn their backs on their beautiful fatherland. Oh no, that is not at all so understandable, nor does it go without saying at all! These men may have been French, but no random French private persons at that; these Frenchmen were – *popes*!! After their election, they were no longer French private persons, but the heads of the christian church! And it is just this that makes it so strange and mysterious: that these French heads of the church felt so little a sensation *in their christian conscience* from the sting of the *un-nature of their exile*, that they lived along without a care to Avignon, as if there were no "God-given centre" of Christendom in the world, as if there were no eternal world capital city Rome, with the altars of the apostle Firsts!

We thus stand immediately before the Avignonian central problem. As we can already recognise, it is of a *religious-psychological* nature.

Who in all the world is capable of solving the big mystery, that the popes did not find anything [objectionable] in throwing one of the most important and holiest traditional dogmas of their church to the old scrap? Did not a more than a thousand year-old holy tradition proclaim the dogma: the chair of the chief herdsman of Christianity stands to Rome?! Was this tradition not the "granite basis", upon which weighed the entire structure of Roman popedom? What?, I ask, was it not tradition and holy conviction of the old pious church fathers and all the previous popes, that the dignity of the Primate, by divine decision, be inseparably connected to the Sedes Romana, i.e. to the Rome residence? Indeed, in the "history" of the Middle Ages, no other dogma of faith has been proclaimed with as much diligence and conviction, been burned into the conscience of the believers, than the dogma of the Primate of the Roman bishop – the dogma of the Sedes Romana! "Inseparably, the idea of popedom was connected to Rome: everything, that was law and entitlement of the popes, rested on the successor-ship of the apostle Prince, the first Roman bishop. To permanently separate from Rome meant cutting off the spiritual root of its power", says Hauck[3]. Yet, for seventy years, the popes enjoyed a good time far from Rome in Avignon. Who can explain this mystery? Peacefully, the exile popes slept in their castle to Avignon as if there were no Rome, as if there were no obliging tradition, according to which, on divine order, the chair of the christian chief herdsman was erected on the grave of the apostle Prince in Rome. Gregorovius, on the one hand, believes that he may be permitted to assume: "The shadow of the abandoned and grieving Rome has disturbed the peace of each pope in the palace to Avignon, because the conviction that Rome was the holy and rightful head of the christian world, was indestructibly firmly rooted in mankind."[4] However, there could hardly be any talk of nightmares, or of the alleged disturbance of the christian conscience of the Avignonian popes, since despite their nightmares, they soulfully-peacefully remained in exile. For example, one of them, John XXII., had allegedly sworn (!) after his election "to never mount a horse, before he had not gone to Rome; he went to Avignon by ship (!), and never mounted a horse." (Gr. IV, p 186, footnote 2) Who can explain, I ask again, how the popes, with unrivalled indifference and carelessness, were capable of so uncommonly disrespectfully thinking of one of

the most important points of the holy tradition? Just how is it to be conceived that these popes themselves, with the greatest indifference, put the axe to the spiritual root of their own power?

The longer we look at the Avignonian problem, the more mysterious it appears. Because not only the indifferent stance of the clerical *head herdsmen* against the tradition of the Sedes Romana is an insoluble riddle, but also the behaviour of the *broad masses of the christian world* with regards to the exile of the church, offers a shook measure [a whole lot] of questionables in religious-psychological terms. What did the Christians say to the fact that now, suddenly, the pope no longer resided in the eternal city of Rome, but someplace in France, and from there, led the church of Christ? Out of Christendom of Italy, England, Germany, did a shout go out towards Avignon: Woe, you popes!? Did the christian world rise up in a mighty phalanx against the church rulers in Avignon, who had sinned against the holiest tradition, in order to air their unwillingness, and to most energetically demand that they [the church rulers] return to Rome on the spot, where, after God's deliberation, the chair of Peter had been erected once and for all? We are listening out for the enormous choir of warning Christians' voices, and – are most amazed to hear *nothing at all* of the expected chorus! Christendom remained silent and did not dream of getting worked up over the resettlement of their chief herdsman's residence to someplace! Only sporadically, a flimsy little voice sounded and was lifted on the wings of a prayer to God, may he mercifully end the decreed exile of his church. Nothing to be heard of a *general* holy unwillingness of Christendom. If we are to grant the (falsified) sources any credibility, there has been, remarkably, a woman who found the courage towards the duty-forgotten Avignonian popes to "thoroughly give" them "a piece of her mind". That woman was the Dominican Catherine of Siena; and the most remarkable about this woman is that she was amongst the vanishingly few in Christendom who took any offence of the popedom's exile at all. Because, as I said, the mass of Christians was far from getting excited in any way over the residential move of the popes.

According to the tradition, Catherine has tirelessly written letters to Avignon, to the effect, may the pope yet, for God's sake, return to "his city" Rome. A writer as well, Petrarca, allegedly sent letters over letters to Avignon, in which he pointed out, to the chief herdsmen, the duty to no longer stay away from the holy location with the bones of the apostle Princes. "No expression is strong enough when he talks of Avignon… In a whole series of letters, which of course, he carefully kept secret (!!), he emptied the vessel of his anger against the town which had removed the residence of the popes from holy Rome… His constantly repeated urgent warnings to leave Avignon, the Avignonian popes took as the pious thoughts of a writer, and rightfully so (!!), for they were no more than that, indeed."[5] So, now: why the artificial excitement? Why, else, barely any other christian soul got upset over the injured tradition of the Sedes Romana! So, individual little voices were making themselves heard, but no enormous christian cry sounded; no united order sounded, as a thousandfold voice, in order to force the return of the popes to Rome. Who can explain this mysterious silence? Did even all of Christendom think: it does not matter at all where our pope resides?? But just how could, amongst catholic Christendom, such unheard of, frosty indifference be possible?? Riddles over riddles.

Does it not almost gain the appearance as if there were no more consciousness at all extant within Christianity, that holy Peter had once erected the ruler's chair for his successors on the shores of the Tiber! Rome? What kind of place is this, anyhow?, the majority of Christians, apparently, must have asked themselves curiously and head-shakingly. Why, the sources themselves report: Back then, Rome "was barely known to the barbarians anymore". (P., p 351)

I ask again: who in all the world is capable of explaining that the entire christian world had accepted the staying away of the popes from the graves of the apostle Princes, and thus the violation of a sanctified traditional dogma, with such icy indifference? Because the tradition of the divinely installed Sedes Romana, of the inseparability of the dignity of the Primate and the Rome residence of the christian chief herdsman, existed yet!! Or did it not?? Of the existence of this tradition, we hear explicitly in the *contemporary* sources. After Clemens V.'s death, cardinal Napoleon Orsini turned to King Philipp the Handsome with a letter, in which he spoke out what all of Christianity had accepted as a dogma: "In the foundation of the faith, the seat of the general church is based in Rome." (R., p 773) If the tradition thus existed, who is capable of making us understand that the christian world did not break out in holy indignation against the duty-forgotten popes? Because the Christians – i.e. the truly pious souls, too – lived along indifferently, and cared precious little as to where their popes resided. The mass of Christianity is crucial; the few exceptions do not count!

Or how, now? *Back then perhaps, this tradition did not exist at all*? At the beginning of the 14th century, the tradition surely could not all of a sudden *vanish* from the consciousness of Christians! So, I raise the question: had this tradition back then even existed already? I will even modify my question thus: "*Has the tradition of the union of the dignity of the Primate and the Sedes Romana formed perhaps only later, perhaps at the time of the falsification action*?" Is such an assumption justified? Why should it not be? Yet, the sources "prove" that the tradition had "indeed" existed. To that, I reply: but in Christianity, the tradition was, as we have seen, *not at all in effect*, "indeed"!

What – in the territory of falsified tradition – do we care for ink and paper! Crucial is the "soul" of the Avignonian mystery factum. Everything rests on the psychology of the described human beings. And the psychology of the Christians remains an insoluble mystery – if, during Avignonian times, supposedly, the tradition of the Sedes Romana had "indeed" existed. Had the thousand-year tradition *factually existed* as obliging dogma, then, in the face of the blatant violation, in all countries of Christianity, holy men would have stood up, and caused a storm-wave of indignation against Avignon. In exactly the same way as, a few decades later, the christian world, in unison, would raise a flaming protest against the violation of the holy tradition by the schism of the church. However, no such thing took place now; only in Italy, a few flimsy little voices sounded against Avignon. The mass of Christians did not care in the slightest about the being away of the popes from the holy city. How could such icy indifference be possible, I ask, if the tradition of the Sedes Romana had really (already) existed back then? We have here a religious-psychological mystery before us, whose solution to investigate and research is not only "permissible", but represents a categorical demand of

science. Now, the statement: if, quite obviously, the tradition of the Rome residence was *not in effect* in Christianity, then such a tradition did *not exist*; this statement expresses a state of affairs, from out of which my above question forces itself: should this tradition have perhaps formed only later, perhaps around the time of the falsification action?

The reader is well advised to long and thoroughly contemplate the problem brushed here. Here, they sense the *first trace to the solution of our quest for the root cause of the falsification action*. On our journey of investigating the hidden root cause of the action, we will, by the religious-psychological mystery of the church's Babylonian exile, point into quite certain a direction, which we will now follow further.

With the notorious indifference of the Avignonian popes towards Rome, the by divine deliberation prescribed seat of popedom, we perceive it as a surprise that the exile of the church eventually found an end yet. Namely, in the year 1377. As said before, the popes could have returned to Rome anytime, had they only had any serious intention of returning. No brute violence forced them to still stay in Avignon. "The decision on staying or going lay with the popes alone." (H., p 672) However, they simply could *not* decide on resettling back. And why should they go to Rome anyway, right? Tradition this, tradition that! Life in Avignon was not all bad, either. And all of the christian world found this quite alright! If we want to believe the source reports, Benedict XII. (1334-1342) had supposedly "seriously planned" to reset Peter's chair back to Rome again. "Only, in those days, the eternal city was the stage for the wildest passions and continuous blood-shed: a pope could not have stayed there." (P., p 71) Who would not understand that Benedict preferred staying in Avignon – not perhaps in order to temporarily wait for the end of the blood-shed in Rome, but to settle in Avignon *forever*. Why, he had built for him the Avignonian pope-burg, half palace, half fortress. Presumably because he said to himself: the continuous blood-shed in Rome is going to carry on for some decades yet, anyhow. Innocenz VI. (1352-62) as well was supposedly "indeed" thinking of at least – visiting Rome; "only, age and frailty frustrated the plan." (P., p 79)

At last, however, an Avignonian pope pulled himself together for making the planned return to the eternal city a reality yet. That was the sanctimonious Urban V. (1362-1370). To him, too, Petrarca had addressed urgent letters of warning. Such as, e.g.: "It is said that the name of Rome be constantly on your lips. It is said that you have uttered that you will find no rest, before you have led your herd there. Let your actions be the confirmation of your word. Think of the fame that is awaiting you, if you lead the long straying church back to the place God had prescribed for her [the church]." (R., p 943) And truly, Urban set off for Rome. As he then, having arrived in Rome, knelt down at the apostles' grave, he shed tears, it is reported, as he spoke the prophet's words: by the rivers of Babylon, we sat down and cried when we remembered Zion[VI]. (R., p 951) 'Well then', the reader thinks: 'in this sanctimonious pope at least, the holy tradition was alive and obliging'. And yet, they [the reader] must experience an enormous disappointment in this pious head herdsman.

[VI] Incidentally, these prophet's words are the title/chorus of a 1970's disco hit by 'Boney M' – talk about 'on all channels'…

Namely, after a short-term stay in Rome, this sanctimonious man was overcome by the longing for his far away home[VII]. And one day, he declared to the confounded believers his firm decision to return back to Avignon! "Neither the conjuring pleading of the Romans and Petrarca's admonition, nor the threat of the holy Brigida that he must die, as soon as he would leave Italy, were capable of putting Urban V. off his decision; to the greatest pain of all true friends of popedom and the church, he returned to Avignon, only to die there soon after his arrival." (P., p 80) It is an equally remarkable and interesting letter that Urban V. addressed to the Romans as a farewell greeting: "We[VIII] know that besides other causes for your lamentations, you are worried that the Roman popes, our successors, might relinquish coming to Rome, when they see that instead of staying on permanently as you hoped, we stayed with you only a short while. Whilst we are deeply lamenting the circumstance, we declare…, that neither we, nor… the cardinals have been pestered in any way at all during these three years in your midst and in the neighbourhood… From that side, there would be no cause for us to leave Rome. However, with God's help, we propose to travel across the sea again, with the intention of bringing benefit to the general church and to the country to which we are going." (R., p 963) Likely rarely has any "Roman bishop" written a letter that offers so great a mystery in religious-psychological terms, as this letter does. In terms of icy indifference, with regards to the holy city of Rome with the apostle graves, an enhancement seems inconceivable. If any further proof were required that, with the Avignonian popes, there could not be any talk of a living effectiveness of the tradition of the Sedes Romana, Urban's letter delivers it strikingly. Rome? Residence Rome? Tradition this, tradition that!, it rings out of these lines. Note well: out of the lines of one of the "noblest and best popes!" (P., p 80) Rome residence of the pope?? What does that even have to do with the christian church? Nothing at all! – thus it sounds from Urban's letter. And because Rome's significance for the christian church is cordially slim, that is why we want to, with God's help, travel across the sea again – the truly pious pope Urban V. wrote, and shook Rome's dust off his shoes. I ask once more: were the Avignonian popes, was an Urban V., was the entire christian world capable of thinking thus, if the tradition had existed back then – as early as back then? On receipt of the news of the [Urban's] death, Petrarca supposedly wrote: "Urban would have counted amongst the most glorious human beings, had he, in dying, have his bed carried before St. Peter's altar." (P., p 80) However, the sanctimonious Urban felt a longing for his pope-burg in Avignon; he felt no longing to exhale his soul at the alleged altar of the apostle Prince. This pious man thought what all of the christian world thought: Rome? Apostle grave? Tradition? What's it all to me? Nothing at all. Quite to the contrary: ubi est papa, ibi Roma! Where the pope is, there is Rome.

In connection with this, it may be necessary to point out the following circumstance. When viewing the Avignonian mystery complex, it is not perhaps, from the *nowadays* standpoint, about being unable to deliver a "direct *proof* for the inseparability of popedom and the Roman Holy See, from the dogma sources: writing and tradition". At the time of the exile as well, it was equally as little about the *proof of the factuality*

[VII] orig.: 'Heimat', the English language does not have that word (I've never come across it, that is), without, again, another host of different meanings attached to it – que faire, lieber Leser/what to do, dear reader?

[VIII] Urban refers to himself in the plural, here.

of this inseparability. That not the church either has officially "defined" this "tradition" as a dogma, changes nothing at all about the state of affairs. What *is* crucial, is Christendom's *general consciousness back then*, of the "truly" God-given, and therefore indestructible union of the dignity of the Primate and the Sedes Romana. What is crucial is the medieval general *belief*. Now, according to the sources of the Middle Ages, the concurring/concurrent[IX] consciousness of the believers – as opposed to the "Heretics" – represented "indeed" the unconditional conviction of the inseparability of the popedom from Rome. And it is just this concurring/concurrent conviction with which the history of the exile popes stands in the sharpest contradiction! Because the behaviour of the believers with regards to the violation of the "general dogma", just this icy indifference of all Christendom with regards to the violation of the tradition, proves that that tradition was *not* alive, *not* in effect. In this stark contradiction, the religious-psychological mystery of the Babylonian exile of the church reveals itself. When, almost immediately after the ending of the exile, the so-called great *schism*, the division of popedom and the church, broke out, very soon, all of Christianity got riled in passionate indignation over such "unnatural state [of affairs]". This time, too, a holy tradition, a divine commandment, had been violated, namely the dogma, that the church be permitted to have only *one* herdsman, *one* pope. This time, the christian world, by all means of force, attempted to give satisfaction to the violated tradition. The exile of popedom, however, with the exceptions being next to nothing, left all of Christendom utterly cold. Of this incomprehensible indifference, however, consists the Avignonian mystery.

Yet, eventually, the Babylonian exile now really found its end. It was in the year 1377, when pope Gregory XI., despite also being Frenchman by birth, ultimately transferred the papal seat back to Rome. Considering the fact, that for about seventy years, Peter's successors, without any noteworthy nagging religious conscience, enjoyed a good time in Avignon, this turn of things means a surprise at least. Especially when it becomes known that one would have been happy to retain Gregory in France, and that several cardinals refused to follow the pope to Italy. "That this time, the frail and frightened pope… victoriously withstood the demands of his environment and those of the French King…, is indeed most admirable." (P., p 89) Yet, not with Gregory either, was it about the disturbance of the conscience over the violation of the Sedes Romana dogma, that drove him back to the by God determined seat of popedom. Much rather, quite material things have supposedly effected that Gregory moved to Italy: namely, threatening circumstances in the church state. (G. VI, p 449) The cheer of the Romans was understandably monstrous when the pope paraded into their town. With olive branches in their hands, the volk's masses went towards him. "A swarm of jumpers, dressed in white, was dancing… ahead of the pope, when he… set off to Rome… The Romans had veiled the streets of their dilapidated, beggarly town with colourful rugs." (G., p 472/473) Gregory XI. really stayed in Rome, and thus, from now on, the papal chair on the one and only spot on which it had to stand, according to the "general conviction of all believers" (!). Soon, however, Gregory had already died, and the task now was to elect a new head of church in Rome. On the tragicomical ongoings on the occasion of this newly election, and

[IX] orig.: 'übereinstimmend', in this case, means exactly both

on the newly elected pope – Urban VI. – we will treat in more detail at a later time. For the time being, we have to concern ourselves with something different and important. Namely, a new problem emerges. A new great mystery becomes visible. And from out of the centre of this new mystery complex, remarkable connection threads are spun across to the mystery factum of the Babylonian exile.

Which question was it again, that resulted from the critical observation of the Avignonian mystery factum? The resulting question was the following: has the tradition of the union of the dignity of the Primate and the Sedes Romana taken shape perhaps only after the Avignonian epoch, around the times of the falsification action? As we have seen, this question is not founded upon fantastical considerations or tinkering, but it follows with necessity from the religious-psychological mystery factum of the Babylonian exile. The indifference of the believers with regards to the fact of the seventy-year absence of popedom from Rome clearly proves to us, that, back then, that tradition did not yet exist in the christian general consciousness. Thus, *it must* have formed *later*! The monstrous result of this finding becomes immediately obvious. The investigated fact, that the tradition of the Sedes Romana had not yet existed around the middle of the 14th century, ultimately means that the history of popedom, and, most closely intertwined with it, *the history of the city of Rome during the Middle Ages*, the way the (falsified) tradition reports, could not have taken place at all! With this, I tell the readers of my previous writings nothing new; because just this was the general result of my previous investigations, that the medieval "history" – and with it of course, the history of popedom and the town Rome – had been systematically falsified from the ground up. Only, the above conducted investigations have, from one certain viewpoint, confirmed anew the general result; but not only that, they have also allowed us to detect the first trace of the hidden root cause of the falsification action. In the following chapter, we follow this trace, by focusing all our attention on the mystery of the town of Rome in the Middle Ages.

2. The mystery of the city of Rome in the Middle Ages

In the district of medieval history, historians have been concerned with no other town in the world as much as with Rome, the christian capital city of the world. This is explainable; because time and again, the look of the researchers is being turned to this town by a twist in medieval world events. Here in Rome, at the seat of the curia, the waves of world and church politics were – according to the tradition – stirred up, and the waves returned back here again and again. We, too, now want to have a look at the world centre of the Middle Ages, that is, we want to view Rome as a real thing of the physical world, simply as a location, as a town, as a

complex of buildings. It is the *town* of Rome that will have our interest. We want to concern ourselves with the architectural state of this town as well as its citizenry. We want to see how, at the time of the Babylonian exile of the church, the state of the town of Rome and its citizenry presented itself, according to the descriptions in contemporary sources. What do the contemporaries report to us on that?

The reader will remember that towards the end of the previous chapter, on the occasion of pope Gregory XI. parading into Rome, it was said: the Romans had the streets of their dilapidated, beggarly town veiled with colourful rugs. Rome a dilapidated, beggarly town? Why, yes, the historians explain to us, could it be any other way? The transfer of the papal court to Avignon caused a decline of the prosperity in the abandoned Rome, which naturally, had to show in the outward image of the town as well. Now, I would not dream of denying this. However, I have been wondering, and ever more wondering about what I read in the reports, how terrible the effects of the absence of the curia in the town of Rome must have been. And the reader will now understand my amazement, when they, too, read these descriptions.

In the already once before mentioned letter of the cardinal Orsini to King Philipp the Handsome from the year 1314, we read with regards to Rome: "Under this pope [Clemens V.; K.], and by him, the town has fallen to utter ruin; the seat of Peter, yes, of our Lord and deliverer has been hit by destruction; the clerical possessions… dilapidate and fade… in abandonment." (R., p 772) For the time around 1320, we hear: "The long absence of popedom became more and more perceptible… the streets, the churches, the palaces turned desolate… the degeneration was limitless." (G., p 108) Around 1350, Petrarca reports from own experience: "The houses down in rubble, the walls are falling, the temples collapsing… The Lateran lay on the ground, and the mother of all churches, without a roof, stands open to wind and rain. The holy abodes of Peter and Paul are faltering, and what was the temple of the apostles a moment ago, is now a shapeless pile of rubble." (G., p 319) We note further: "At the time of Urban V., Rome could be compared to what the town was at the time of Gregory the Great, or it offered a view still more chaotic. Because the ruins of antiquity, the destroyed temples, were joined by those of Christianity, the destroyed churches. S. Peter was in tatters, S. Paul raised to the ground years ago, and a new fire in the year 1360 has devoured the Lateran. Almost all basilicas and monasteries were dilapidated, and were barely inhabited by few clerics. Bogs and rubble were disfiguring places and streets, in which burst towers, burned down houses and devastation of all kinds presented the repulsive chronicle of all wars which the town had suffered in the 14th century… When the pope… moved through the narrow and damp alleys, the death silence of the town frightened him, and more so the looks of a volk whose appearance and nature testified to moral degeneration and beggarly poverty." (G., p 427 to 428) A description of the town for the time around 1375: "The churches were so dilapidated and neglected, that in St. Peter and the Lateran, the herds were grazing in the grass up to the altar. Many God houses were without a roof, others close to collapsing." (P., p 61) Already, for a previous time, we learn of the age-honoured basilica St. Peter: "The decay of the brittle roof-truss of St. Peter, for which John XXII. took protection measures as early as 1320, and which a storm in 1334 partly blew off, appeared to be a visible symbol of the brittleness

and hollowness of the state of affairs of the clerical masters whom that roof housed." (*Hist. Jahrb.* Vol. 27, p 273; [*Historical Annuals*]) We enter the 15th century and learn of the state of Rome from around 1420, the times of Martin V.: "The world capital city had completely turned to ruins; it presented an unspeakably sad appearance: rubble, decay and poverty wherever one looked… The general poverty was so great that in the year 1414, no lamps could be lit even at the confession of the apostle Princes on the celebration Peter and Paul. Some clerics had… neither food nor clothing… the town in which the poor lived was a big field of rubble, into which the miserable abodes were built." (P., p 167/8) And finally, another description of Rome from the times of Eugene IV. (1431-1447): "The town has… become like a village of cattle herders; sheep and cows were roaming in it, even in places where now the banks of the traders are standing" – a biographer of Eugene reports. (G. VII, p 8) On that, Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste* [*History of the popes*] I., p 250: "In the Vatican territory, the wolves dared come out onto the cemetery next to St. Peter 's church at night, and scrape up the corpses of the ones buried there."[X]

Now, the reader will understand my amazement, and will have turned wondering themselves. What a terrible decay of the proud capital city of the world! Over the course of a century, the proud head of Christianity has sunk from a world city to a miserable cattle village! And, just to show an important point right away: the boundless decay of Rome took place not only during the decades in which the curia was absent, but the decay progressed with the same intensity, even when the papal chair again stayed in Italy and – at least temporarily – in Rome itself!

We have to confess: in the "world capital city Rome", it did not look at all pretty in the 14th and the first half of the 15th century. Dirty alleys filled with rubble! The houses most all dilapidated! Many churches without a roof, and the main churches of Christianity even overgrown with grass up to the altar! A village of beggarly cattle herders! No, truly, the eternal Rome of this epoch could not brag with glory, glimmer and beauty. Basically, the proud Roma was not a town anymore at all, but a right miserable village of herders! Thus, the medieval sources themselves reassure us. Is it any wonder, I ask, if the thoughtful reader experiences the same that I have: that in the face of this description of dilapidation, they shake their head, and that they are swarmed by all sorts of peculiar thoughts? It that even possible?, they shout. So this is what the "world capital city" looked like at the end of the Middle Ages? Now, in this cattle-village-like world city, however – as we will have told to us later – there supposedly also lived a "*numerous*" citizenry, which was supposedly looked after by "*town authorities*". We try frantically drafting an impression of the life and ongoings of this citizenry of the deserted world city; it is not happening, because we stumble across a mountain of mysteries and impossibilities. Despite the best intentions, we are unable to paint a picture of the official activity of the secular and clerical authorities of those days; those authorities who have not even weeded out the grass in the main churches of their "city"! But perhaps those official places were merely

[X] This fiction 'style' smells just like 'Holocaust' tales, does it not?

thinking practically and economically, if they were not intent on reducing the grazing opportunities of their herds – who can say!?

While, sunk in all sorts of thoughts, we rest head-shakingly before the vision of a grass-grown stone-seeded void, of which we are reassured it to be the "world capital city" Rome at the end of the Middle Ages – this question involuntarily forces itself upon us: *could this dilapidation from the world capital city to the village of herders have been at all possible*? Namely, under the described circumstances, and over a period of around five decades? Because as early as 1350, Rome was supposed to be the horrible scene of rubble, the way the "town" supposedly was around 1400 and later still. Once again, the relativistic history researchers must decline the above question as impermissible. The historian, they explain, has to merely establish the historical factum as such, by careful examination and comparison of the sources. Engaging in contemplations over the *possibility* of a historical factum, they – from their relative standpoint quite rightly – consider absurd. What happened, has happened, the relativists shout; and *because* it happened, it is thus proven that the factum was possible and even necessary! Now, I can contain myself, too, objecting to the logical consequence of this statement. Much rather, I have to agree with the historians – *inasmuch as their statement refers to real history*! However, I have to point out with emphasis, that with the above question of the possibility of the dilapidation of the city of Rome, we find ourselves in the *district of falsified history*! Whatever, in the district of falsified medieval tradition, the (forged) sources present as a historical factum, represents a *questionability*! On the territory of falsified tradition, we must, as a matter of principle, trust no reported factum. No matter how many sources testify to and confirm a "factum" by records, we must not accept it trustingly and blind as historically real. Much rather, the so-called facts of the falsified tradition are first to be subjected to a critical procedure, an experiment. This experiment extends to the spiritual core of the reported factum, that is, it is concerned with the *psychology* of the *authors* reporting that factum, and the psychology of the *human beings making this factum a reality*, respectively. In the presented case, we subject the psychology of the human beings, who are making the factum (of Rome's dilapidation) a reality, to the necessary critical examination. Following from this, our question is now this: could Rome's dilapidation from a world capital city to a village of herders have been possible *with regards to the psychology of the involved human beings*? Once again, the question is of a *religious*-psychological nature. Speaking in methodological terms, we thus, as always, when it is about the last test of medieval source material, step out of the paper tradition, and take our viewpoint externally, namely in the *world of living experience*. We deploy absolute critique.

First however, we are still forced to endeavour on the following contemplations:

On the basis of a good dozen penetrating arguments – the reader finds them compressed in the "Historical Mysteries of the World" – the result of my previous investigations is the unshakeable fact that *at the end of the Middle Ages*, the entire medieval tradition has been falsified as the result of a systematic action. This now means that also all those source reports are under the suspicion of purposeful falsification, which refer to the *local state of affairs* of the medieval town Rome.

The nature of the subject, with regards to the falsified tradition, results in an exceedingly important **bipartition** of the presented pseudo-historical material. Depending on the truth content, the falsified tradition breaks up into two layers, which however, show a very different thickness. How is this to be understood? The situation is this: *the essence of authenticity in the forged sources gradually and continually increases, the more we approach the threshold of modern times*. A fundamental difference in the essence of historical authenticity exists especially between the sources inasmuch as they refer to the time from *before* the year 1300, and the time from *after* 1300. How this is to be understood, a picture may illustrate: whilst far away from the shore, the firm ground lies deep below the sea level, with an approach of the mainland, the ground of the sea more and more surfaces, and is finally completely transformed into mainland. Thus, from the medieval sea of sources of make-belief and falsification, historical truth gradually rises up into the light *with the approach of modern times*. In this process of the gradual rising-up-into-the-light of historical truth, it is now possible to clearly distinguish the mentioned two layers. Stage *one*: the tradition up to around the year 1300. The enormous mass of this layer of tradition is characterised by the fact that it has, via the great action, been falsified and riddled with purpose lies to the very core in such a way, that the fabricated pseudo-historical chaos can only ever be accepted and rated as historical fiction. The real history of the epoch up to around 1300 has to such a degree been jumbled together, sieved and erased, been replaced and corroded by poetic elements in such a way, that the historical truth of these medieval centuries, has completely vanished beneath the over-flooding sea of fiction. (Substantial falsification.) Stage *two*: the tradition *after* 1300. Now, from around the year 1300 onwards, despite the sources still being falsified, their authenticity essence, all of a sudden, increases considerably. However, these sources do still not yet present *pure* real history, but more or less *impurified* real history. (Accidental falsification) In this layer of sources, truth and fiction are approximately balanced. And only from around the year 1500 onwards, the core-authentic massif of true history rises up out of the sea of the falsified tradition. [oh, du ahnungsloser Engel! = oh, you sweet, innocent and clueless angel!][XI] *Occasional* forgeries may have also occurred after 1500 ['occasional' *really* doesn't hit it]; but they are after-effects of the now factually ended great action as such, which alone is what we are interested in, for the time being.

That this is so, that this bipartition of the falsified tradition *must* exist, follows necessarily from the nature, especially from the point in time of the falsification action. For reasons which I have explained in Book 3 of *The Falsification of German History*, the start of the great action is to be fixed around the year 1400. Thus, around 1400, the falsification campaign set in. Quite without a care, the forgers' consortium was able to indulge in the fabrication of their pseudo-historical purpose fiction that was deemed necessary – *as far as* the creation of the history of the *earliest* and *early* Middle Ages were an option in this. Who should have

[XI] Wasn't he, Kammeier, really? From his point in time, there would be WWI, the 'Weimar' republic, the Russian revolution, Germany in the '19'th back to the '16'th century per se etc. etc... It's all lousy with lies. They've never stopped doing it to this very minute I'm typing/you're reading this, and they sure started long before '1300', while we're at it.

hindered the knowing fathers to portray this *early* "history" in the way that was required by the scheme of the purpose? Because obviously, the completed documents and codices for this early medieval period were not handed out to the uninitiated profane[XII] for a lecture, but they wandered as "learned" ware into the certain archives in Europe, in order to, for the time being, for a long time, be available only to the eyes of the initiated. However, when the "history" of the *last* centuries of the Middle Ages was to be taken under correction, the fabrication of the sources had to be carried out *more subtly*. Why one had to proceed more gently now is easily understandable. Because with the falsification of the sources for the epoch of the *last* medieval centuries, the task, urged by necessity, was *to make allowances for the actual circumstances of the, back then, present times*! The fathers of the action found themselves confronted with the task of gradually joining the stream of the falsified tradition with the sea of true history of the, back then, present times. It was no option to confront a, from the ground up falsified, history with the real contemporary history. A gradual transition from fiction to truth was an unconditional requirement. So, the forgers had to proceed more cautiously the more they approached the present time within the sources. Especially in the fabrication of documents, they were subjected to the ultimate necessity of skilfully connecting the forgery threads to the existing legal circumstances. Around 1450, with regards to the "history" from around 1300, the action's fathers were able to forge and even invent quite heartily, and they have not been exactly unwilling in doing so, but now, it was necessary to equally balance truth and fiction. The *basic shape* of real history from around 1300 onwards could no longer be totally erased everywhere, but it was possible to skilfully veil and purposefully decorate it. So, the sources of the "history" of the 14th and 15th century still *lie* – that is, both in countless individual facts as well as in the portrayal of the world political state of affairs – but despite the falsified shell, the critical eye succeeds in recognising, right through the veil, the historical reality in at least coarse outlines. Summarised, the result of our deliberations is this: the sources for the period *after* 1300 are more credible than the sources before this epoch!

We now return to the descriptions of the town of Rome with regards to its state in the 14th and 15th century. The sources report, as we remember, of a monstrous decay of the world capital city. It is reported that the flourishing city of old, at the end of the period of decay, has been no more than merely a village of herders. Is such enormous decay and fall of Rome even possible?, we thus asked once before. The sources, indeed, confirm this factum; but we of course know, that these sources are the output of the falsification action, and that because of this, their "facts" appear suspicious from the start, the lot of them. Therefore, the "factum" of the decay of the town of Rome must also be subjected to a critical procedure with regards to its authenticity and truth. For this purpose, we will have to accurately examine the psychology of the human beings making this factum a reality. However, already before we begin with this experiment, we can establish a very important statement with regards to the decay factum by remembering, in connection with this, the statement: the sources for the period after 1300 are more credible than the sources before this epoch. "In the

[XII] 'the uninitiated profane' – a sweet little accidental connector to freemasonry, and no mistake, either.

Middle Ages, Rome was a world city" – the sources *before* 1300 report. "Rome is a miserable village" – the sources report *after* 1300. This latter, the more recently reported factum, is more credible than the first! This second factum as such is even *believable as such*; namely for the reason that it was not only temporally very close to the then present time – the time of the falsification action – but because it reaches directly into that present time. All sources on the threshold to modern times report that the christian "modern city" of Rome has been built – or, as they express themselves, re-built – only from around the middle of the 15th century. Before that, Rome was supposedly a place of devastation, a void, a village. Before that, i.e. before the period of devastation, as the sources before 1300 report, Rome was a big city, namely the city of the medieval popes. What the sources report on the state of Rome *after* 1300, is thus more credible. I now raise the question: should it be a blatant lie, what the falsified sources *before* 1300 have to tell about an alleged *city* of Rome?? Before 1300, just before the alleged period of devastation, should a *city* of Rome have not even existed at all? *In the Middle Ages, has a city of Rome even existed at all*? Should also all reports of the "dilapidation" of a previously existing, flourishing world city be a bunch of lies? I politely ask the reader to not shy away from these questions, but to focus their view on them, applying the sharpest critique. Certainly, the sources before 1300, again and again, tell of the papal world capital city of Rome in the Middle Ages; but may the reader remember the general result of my previous writings: the entire history of the Middle Ages has been systematically falsified during the course of the great action. And that means at the same time: all information on Rome's state in the Middle Ages is under suspicion of being falsified, too. Our question: has a *town/city* of Rome even existed in the Middle Ages?, is thus, considering the factual falsification of all medieval history, not only permissible, but to ask it, has become our duty. The fact of the falsification action forces us to a critical disposition towards *every* detail in the falsified sources. A priori, we must not trust a single factum. Every factum of the falsified tradition must be subjected to the baptism of fire of absolute critique, if else, we are serious about establishing historical truth. Only that can be considered truth, that has withstood this baptism of fire.

Above, I've said: towards the end of the Middle Ages, the firm ground of historical truth and reality gradually emerges from the fiction's turbid ocean of mud. Only *after* 1300, the historical truth in its basic shape is gaining firm ground. Let us now throw a quick glance at the history of the popes, that is, with regards to the *residence* of the popes. Where do we see the popes reside in the 14th century? Not to Rome! The popes sit in the French town of Avignon! Before, they supposedly resided in Rome – that is what the sources *before* 1300 tell. With the information now, that Avignon supposedly was the papal residence in the 14th century, we hold in our hands a nib of historical reality. Even as late as the beginning of the 15th century, a pope sat in the castle to Avignon. Avignon – a papal residence! As we are yet to see, this factum of the sources *after* 1300 withstands our critique, too. It was of course also impossible that the falsification associates could blatantly flog this swindle to the whole world, that the pope had only very recently, why, during the falsification period itself, resided in Avignon – if in truth, that had *not* been the case – if, in truth, he had resided elsewhere all the time, for example in Rome! Thus, the details of the sources after 1300, with regards to Avignon as papal

residence, per se and essentially, contain a truly historical factum. The information of the sources before 1300 on the other hand, according to which Rome had supposedly been, *back then*, the residence of the popes, remains questionable to the highest degree, for as long as they have not been examined for their historical truth content in the fire of the absolute critique.

We want to close this chapter by viewing, side by side, the Avignonian mystery of the Babylonian exile, and the mystery of the city of Rome. From the Avignonian mystery factum, the conclusion follows that at the time of the alleged exile, the tradition of the Sedes Romana cannot have existed yet, i.e. that therefore, it must have formed later. That would mean: the tradition according to which before 1300, *Rome* was the divinely implemented residence of the popes, turns out to be most questionable. This questionability is now being confirmed and strengthened by the mystery of the city of Rome in the Middle Ages. As we know, this mystery pushed upon us the question: in the Middle Ages, has a town Rome even existed at all? If before 1300 and up to 1400, a town Rome had not existed, then it would also become clear in one stroke, that, and why, a tradition of the Rome residence of the popes in the Middle Ages, at the time of the exile, could not have existed in the general consciousness of the Christians. Then, the icy indifference of all Christendom towards Rome would be very well understandable. Now, if before 1300, there was no town Rome at all, then the descriptions of the alleged horrible decay are also questionable, nay, lies. Then, the alleged resettlement of popedom from Rome to Avignon is also a lie. Understand right: popedom's *resettlement from* Rome is a lie; Avignon as papal residence, on the other hand, represents, for previously given reasons, a truly historical factum. Much amazed, the reader now asks: then, the popes have resided in Avignon during the entire Middle Ages?? I have to politely ask for a little more patience; at the end of this Book, the reader will be given the surprising answer to their question. Before that, the Rome mystery will once again fully occupy our attention.

3. The historical quintessence of the Rome mystery

So, in the 14th century, Rome still was an insignificant village – –. Halt!, the historians of course now shout, and peremptorily demand to speak. Halt, they shout, this is not how to lecture on history. You lecture irresponsibly one-sided, they shout. You are completely suppressing the other side of the tradition, the historians accuse me. I am ashamed. Oh yes, right, the *other* side! Sure, that one is there, too! But frankly, it was not my intention to suppress the other side of the tradition. Since with this other side, I am offered the welcome opportunity to give the reader an example, with what shamelessness the fathers of the falsification action have made use of the deliberate contradiction when fabricating their sources.

So, let us once again browse the sources, in order to establish what the "other side" of the tradition has to report to us with regards to the state of the world capital city Rome during the 14th and the first half of the 15th century. In doing so, the reader will bump into one surprise after another.

"The long absence of the curia was undeniably the strongest of all reasons", says Gregorovius, "that have caused Rome's so thorough dilapidation. However, one has to stand up against the exaggerations (!), which later (!) history writers have made about the state of the city. Neither had Rome reduced to only 17000 citizens, nor had the Roman people degenerated to such a degree that they were comparable to a lawless horde. The city was still a republic that had to arm its own forces, and was capable of warring cities." (G., p 429) Enormous amazement of the stunned reader! Now, that sounds quite different for a change! What now? Right, at the time when Urban V. made his brief visit to Rome, Rome has counted by no means only 17000 citizens, but a lot more. So, Rome a world city yet!! Back then, this world city was even capable of arming stately own forces. Thus, the city coffers were fairly filled. The reader is struggling for composure when they now remember the earlier descriptions of misery and decay. Let us hear more however. Reumont, too, reassures us: "Rome's dilapidation was considerable. But it has been exaggerated… During the times of Henry VII., if in the part of town that was loyal to him (!), there were around ten thousand citizens capable of bearing arms, and fifty years on, the actual volk minus the Barons and the lower nobility was able to put up twenty-two thousand men…, the feigned counts, calculating seventeen thousand on the return of the popes, cancel themselves out." (R., p 996)

With boundless amazement, the reader sees the "other" picture of Rome unfold before their inner eye; they perceive a flourishing world city with numerous citizenry. Before dinner, they may have read something completely different, but my God, those were exaggerations of the effects of the dilapidation of the "actually" still rich and flourishing world capital city. But let us hear more. In the year of jubilee 1350, it was enormously lively inside Rome's walls. Gigantic streams of pilgrims from all over the world were rolling towards the eternal city. "From Christmas to Easter, supposedly 1.200.000 people were regularly in town, between Easter and Whitsun 800.000, during the rest of the time, never fewer than 200.000… Certainly, there is stark exaggeration in those figures, but the rush must have been overwhelming." (R., p 884) Now, the reader really does not get out of the state of amazement anymore. "The sweat cloth of Christ was shown on Sundays and festive days in St. Peter [during the year of jubilee; K.], and the pushing and shoving was so bad during this, that sometimes up to 12 human beings found their death." The reader grabs their head. They have once before heard of St. Peter, no? What was that again? What? Have they not been told before that the basilica of St. Peter had, around that time, already been a *ruin*?? To go over the top, we want to have this confirmed once again by Petrarca, who also was amongst the Rome pilgrims in November of the year of jubilee (R., p 886): "The Lateran lay on the ground, and the mother of all churches, without a roof, stands open to wind and rain. The holy abodes of Peter and Paul are faltering, and what was the temple of the apostles a moment ago, is now a shapeless pile of rubble." (G., p 319) And that already *before* the year of

jubilee, things were looking rather gloomy for St. Peter, we would also like to have once again confirmed equally officially: "The decay of the brittle roof-truss of St. Peter, for which John XXII. took protection measures as early as 1320, and which a storm in 1334 partly blew off, appeared to be a visible symbol of the brittleness and hollowness of the state of affairs of the clerical masters whom that roof housed." (*Hist. Jahrb.* Vol. 27, p 273) Now, if we also remember that for the time of Urban V. as well, i.e. around one to two decades *after* the year of jubilee, it has been established: St. Peter was dilapidated, and that around 1370, the cows were grazing in the grass up to the altar in St. Peter, – we cannot hold back with the conviction that the sources on St. Peter in the 14th century are lying to us as fast as a horse can trot. Now, which side of the tradition is lying fiction? Patience, dear reader, more on that in the following.

Another famous cult scene of Rome, namely the Lateran church, we also want to have once presented to us in the source descriptions, while we're at it. There is one event that is remarkable, from the year during which Urban V. stayed in Rome. "Not long after his arrival in Rome, he [Urban; K.] had the heads of the apostles Peter and Paul taken out from their hiding place, where they were secured during the Saracenic assaults. He himself, and the cardinal Capoccio, from the loggia of the Lateran church, have shown the relics to the people." (R., p 957) This time, too, the reader starts thinking, because they have also heard of the Lateran already. Right: in the year 1360, "a new fire had devoured" the Lateran! Despite this now, in 1370, Urban shows the people these relics from the loggia of the Lateran church. The history writers are taking the word: well now, we have official evidence that Urban had effected restoration works in the Lateran. Then however, the restoration works must have been carried out most carelessly; then Urban must have had erected, if not Potemkin [make-belief] villages, so at least Potemkin walls and roofs. The whole cardboard splendour lasted only about one decade; because around 1375 already, as is known to us, the cows again found the best grazing opportunities in the church of the Lateran as well as in that of St. Peter!

Nonetheless, we want to, for a little more still, let the *other* side of the tradition take the stage. We still want to present here some of the glorious descriptions of the billowing life of Rome's numerous citizenry. Talk shall be of buzzing festivities, of the carnival and bullfights in the "richly populated" eternal city of those mystery-laden days. So, for example, an excellent bullfight has taken place in the world capital city in the year 1332, as the sources know to report. (R., p 812) However, I do not want to keep from the reader what Reumont has to remember on this beautiful report. "May be, that such a bullfight has supposedly taken place; that the details of the description are true, is to be doubted. There is a great confusion in the names (!) of the individuals of the more well-known families [who were supposedly participating in the festivities; K]…, so that more than probably, the information is an invention of the author, who lived in the first half of the 15th century" [at the time of the falsification action!; K]. (R., p 1207) Will you look at that: glorious descriptions plucked from thin air! And back then, the Romans were supposedly poor wretches? As the reader will remember, yes, Rome's history writers have previously reassured us to that effect with certainty, but all of a sudden, they have found something entirely different on this in the sources. Poor wretches, the Romans

supposedly were? Oh please, no thought of it! For example, during the carnival of the year 1372, Rome was buzzing. When the last days of the carnival had arrived, the preparations for the bullfight were underway. "Everybody let a decorated… oxen be led by a constabler, and one was collecting food stuff… One could see whole rows of baskets with ham, Bologna sausages, horse cheese, bakeware, fruit and pitchers of good wine… On carnival Sunday, the festive train moved from the Capitol to the Testaccio… First came the trades, each with their banner, close to thirty-two thousand (!) well-dressed (!!) persons, then thirteen (!) triumph carriages, one for each Rion [region; K]…" (R., p 998) That does not sound like beggarly poverty in Rome. Only, it is suspicious that Reumont, with regards to this shining illustration, has to say something "of doubts with regards to its credibility".

And now to some "evidence" from the sources, how much the clerical life in Rome back then was pulsating, too. "The papal court was far away, but popedom and cardinalate… had to keep an eye on Rome. There is one (!) index of the Roman churches, monasteries, hospices, chapels and the attached clergy from the Avignonian time. It counts five patriarchal churches, twenty-seven cardinal titles besides the Lateranian, eighteen cardinal's diaconates, twenty-eight monks' and religious order monasteries, eighteen nuns' cloisters, twenty-five hospices, eleven pope chapels, twenty-one collegiate chapels, two hundred and fifty-two parish churches with one or two clerics, out of which however, forty-four... were… without staff, eleven completely destroyed, many in a defective state with regards to walls and roofs." (R., p 994) 28 monks' and 18 nuns' convents! 252 parish churches (some of which completely destroyed, and many in a defective state however)! Oh, what enormous life must have been surging in the world capital city back then!

So this is Rome's other, namely the shiny, side. So, we have thus, as befitting a conscientious historian, viewed Rome of the 14th and the beginning of the 15th century from the front and the back, just those mentioned "two sides". Over this observation, the reader grew a little confused, which of course makes no wonder now. Two sides do exist, there is no denying it. Two entirely different pictures are shown to us in the two frames. Critically assessed, this means: on Rome in the Avignonian times, the sources give us absolutely contradictive information. Desperately, we are wondering: now, what actually did it really look like in Rome back then? Was Rome back then a stony void, a village of cattle herders? Or was the Rome of those days a flourishing world city? Only *one* of these two frames can show the true, real face of Rome. Surely, there is only an either-or? Not at all, the historians say. Missed the target, they shout. The truth lies neither right nor left, they explain, the truth quite simply lies in the middle! It is of course clear as daylight, the historians reassure, that simply *both* sides have *exaggerated*! So, if we only draw an ideal middle line, we have thus effortlessly found the truth. In admiration for such historical-scientific master class work, I look at the historians. So *this* is how you pull off the trick of dragging the historical truth into the light?!

In a different place, I have said it before: when the relativists are finishing their preparatory work, for me, the actual work only starts. I have to thus confess, the longer critically viewed, the more the above artificially tempered middle-truth of our history researchers, too, appears to me as a conglomerate of many

riddles. I find it incomprehensible, how the critical conscience of the Rome researchers can calm down with the above "truth", how one does not sense that this artificial truth is a bag full of riddles.

So, we are told, in the mutually contradicting descriptions of the town of Rome, there were exaggerations towards both sides. Fine. But now, please, somebody tell me for once what it really looked like in Rome. Somebody explain to me what the real state of Rome was. But look at that, our poor history researchers of Rome are unable to do this. What they are capable of doing, and what they also like doing, is that *one time*, they let the misery sources do the talking, and *another time*, the glory sources, and then they leave it to the smart reader to save themselves from the two source fires onto an ideal and neutral middle ground. Hopelessly torn to and fro by the two hostile sides of the mutually contradicting sources, the researchers talk all day, one time, they say this, and another time, something quite different. Only, the ideal middle truth they regrettably never proclaim in their books. Certainly, here and there, they say: there have been exaggerations; but elsewhere, they explicitly point out to us: "It is difficult to gain a sufficient (!!) impression of the magnitude of the degeneration, of the utter dilapidation, which had befallen Rome back then." (P., p 62) So, dear reader: despite the decay illustrations being "exaggerated", it is yet, based on these illustrations, very difficult to gain a "sufficient impression" of how *horrible* Rome's dilapidation was! Only one thing is for certain: if the misery descriptions are not *enormously* exaggerated, then the shining descriptions must be not only "a little exaggerated", but then, they must be outright lies. If however, the shining descriptions, also besides some "exaggerations", are correct, then Rome cannot have sunk to a deserted void. Therefore, the big question after all yet is: which side of the source reports shows the true face of Rome?

So, the history researchers *themselves*, can*not* conjure the neutral middle truth out of the mutually contradicting sources; and to my shame, I have to concede that I am equally unable to perform this trick. By the way, one of the older researchers, namely Papencordt, seems to have sensed, and perhaps even tested, the hopelessness of this operation. In his history of the city of Rome, he writes the remarkable sentence: "On this occasion, the author has not found it adequate [orig.: 'gut'] to interlace a description of the state of the town, and its monstrous dilapidation resulting from the long absence of the popes, respectively."[6] Papencordt seems to have realised this: if I bring the misery descriptions, I thus paint on my canvas the desolate picture of a miserable village of cattle herders. However, in this villagey void, I cannot possibly unfold the history of a "world city", which is yet written down, on the other hand, in the sources. No town history can take place in a void. And so, Papencordt found that the only right thing to do was to suppress the uncomfortable misery illustrations completely. This may attest to an aptitude for avoiding uncomfortable problems, but not to any courage for tackling problems.

So, our question is now this: do the misery descriptions exaggerate Rome's true state? I answer this question with a '*no*'! Let us suppose for a moment, with all the harmlessness of the relativists, the sources under scrutiny were "indubitably authentic", then that means, that in many of the mentioned sources, *eye*

witnesses are talking to us. According to the sources, Petrarca, for example, has seen Rome's localities with his own eyes. When he, on the occasion of Clemens VI.'s accession to the throne, laments, "that the church of the Lateran… is without a roof and open to snow and rain"[7], he thus reports what he has seen for himself. Very well, one could interject, as is well-known, Petrarca was a writer, and in the sweet madness of his poetic enthusiasm, and indignation, respectively, he has potentially put on the dark colours a little too thick. Most swiftly however, we are set right: "That the description… of the writer is no deception, is witnessed by the introduction, which Rome's citizenry addressed to Gregory XI. in the year 1376: 'Return back, because the cardinals' churches, those sanctified scenes of the holy remainders of so many blood witnesses, are abandoned by those who have the duty to care for them, so that while they are suffering want on the roofs, gates and walls, they stand open to the herds that graze in the grass up to the altars.'"[8] Thus reads an admonition of Rome's citizenry to the pope to Avignon. According to this, Petrarca has by no means exaggerated; his report concurs with that of the citizenry. However, could not both – Petrarca and the Roman citizens – have described the decay strongly exaggerated? This can be absolutely ruled out. Petrarca and the Romans could not have possibly gotten away with lying to the popes and to all of the world, that Rome's main churches were grass-grown ruins, if that in truth had not been the case. In order to realise this, all we have to do is to think of ourselves in this state of affairs. After all, our reporters did not perhaps describe scenes situated on the moon, but localities which were accessible to everybody back then. Equally, all of the world could have convinced themselves by their own eyesight, whether the reports corresponded with the truth, or whether they were either outright lies, or exaggerations, respectively. If, in those times, these most venerable churches and cult scenes of Christianity had been merely "a little defective and neglected", and if, besides this, they had stood firmly and in one piece, the Roman reporters in their right mind would then have been careful not to broadcast to the world the monstrous fairy tale, that in these holy locations, the cows were grazing in the grass up to the altars! After all, these were no collapsed cattle stables, but the most venerable cult scenes which Christianity possessed. The popes, who were able to obtain reports on the true state of affairs from their legates in Rome, would have not long been owing the relevant response to such "harmless exaggerations" of the turned-insane letter writers, who pretended to have visions of grazing herds in an intact and roofed church. Again, these were not any old cattle stables, but the main churches of Christendom. One would have begged to decline with all emphasis that such cruel jokes about these holy locations were circulated. Or, much rather: no sensible human being in Rome would have dreamt of inventing such hoax news about the Roman main churches, let alone send them out into the world as letters of lament. If the Romans, if Petrarca, had their five senses about them – which we must surely assume yet – then, they would have been careful not to eternally embarrass themselves in such stupid and obvious fashion before their entire contemporary world. Thus, the detailed information on the dilapidation cannot represent exaggerations; much rather, it must be founded on truth – *on the one condition however: that the sources are authentic*! What this condition means, we will find out later.

In the chaotic billowing of the mutually contradicting source reports on Rome's state, we have, by now, gained some, to some extent, firm ground; because if the information of the rubble-like state of Rome's

main churches were founded on truth, then, something else follows with absolute certainty, namely: *the descriptions of Rome as a world city with a large citizenry and enormous life are lying fiction*!

To reinforce the accuracy of this conclusion will now be my task. I will rid myself of it by subjecting the psychology of the involved persons to a critical observation. Always assuming that the sources are authentic!

We are to recollect it again: the basilica St. Peter and the Lateran church to Rome were – besides the localities of Palestine – the holiest cult scenes of the world that Christianity owned. Especially the old venerable St. Peter's church, by the "double holiness of the location, a martyr scene and a burial place, has grown to become a heart's affair for Christendom. The earlier popes had furnished this church with high gifts of grace; for it enjoyed the absolution of all sins, i.e. a complete remission." (Historische Jahrbücher, Vol. 30, p 17) Now, over the course of a few decades, this holy cult scene has supposedly dilapidated to a grass-grown ruin – or, more pointedly: *under the eyes of* Rome's *Christians*, St. Peter has supposedly slowly changed into a pile of rubble! Devout Christians have supposedly *not prevented*, that this most holy place sank to a cattle meadow! That is a religious-psychological impossibility. No matter how much Christianity may have encrusted into a mere form of appearance with those Romans, and may they have been reduced to name inscriptions – they would not possibly have let their most prestigious cult scene turn into a cattle stable. Yes, their Christianity's disposition of being superficially formal would have urged them to find superficial satisfaction especially in the *outward sheen* of their first cult scenes. One could interject, the Roman people had simply degenerated into a God-less horde of bandits, to whom nothing was holy at all anymore. However, that is not at all correct, because according to an already mentioned source report, back then in Rome, besides other churches, 25 monks' and 18 nuns' convents, and even 252 parish churches have supposedly existed. According to this report, the entire clergy of these churches and monasteries supposedly consisted of 785 secular clerics, 317 priests who were at the same time members of a religious order, 8 abbots, 126 monks and 470 nuns. (C., p 39/40) No matter how superficialised we are to imagine the Christianity of these clerics – and the Romans as such – they at least were, and wanted to be, Christians in their superficial manner, and according to their disposition of formality. And also according to that report, they kept their exceedingly numerous churches – with a few exceptions – in an orderly state, of course. (Again, we always treat this source information so, *as if it were authentic*!) Now, these Christians should have let, of all things, their holiest and most prestigious cult scenes dilapidate into piles of grass-grown rubble?! That is religious-psychologically impossible! What is more, we have yet other reports on what zeal the Romans have still proven to apply in the year 1308, when the task was to re-erect the Lateran church, which had been destroyed by a raging fire back then. "The fire of the mother church of Christianity seemed like a judgement of God to the Romans. The party formations and the fighting stopped at once. Folk of every age, every sex, every class hurried to do penance. Festive marches were held, and the penance-doing men castigated themselves publicly. At the same time, the re-erection of the church was swiftly begun. Men, women and children lent an active

hand in clearing the rubble, or the procurement of building materials, so that no animal would be used and thus the sanctuary be defiled." [XIII] (P., p 343)

Now, in the times to follow, the same Romans stood by inactively and without any interest, and watched their most venerable churches sink to rubble. Equally, overnight, their religious feelings should have cooled, because – the pope did no longer stay in their midst? And out of the blue, they should have lost all interest in their *holiest* cult scenes, of all things?! Religious-psychologically, that would be unexplainable. It certainly was primarily the clerical Sirs' task, especially that of the archpriest of St. Peter, to take care of the maintenance of their cult scene. But this much is sure: had these Sirs been so unbelievably neglectful in their duty, that they let the roof of the basilica collapse over their heads, then the Roman citizens would have found ways and means of putting a stop to such disfiguration of their highest sanctuary. Yet, what zeal have they applied in re-erecting the destroyed Lateran church still as late as the year 1308! And, as the sources know to report, the Romans of course were by no means poor wretches, because as soon as was needed, they were able to equip stately hosts of troops. Next: "At all times, crowds of devotees from the whole Occident gathered (in Rome) to pray at the graves of the apostles. In these decades, should these devotees, too, have kneeled on the grass-grown scenes of ruin of Rome's collapsed main churches in utmost indifference? No matter from which side we may be advancing with critical observation, the unlimited dilapidation of especially Rome's holiest scenes proves irrefutably: the shining illustrations must be made up! *That* side of the source reports that wants to conjure a *world city* Rome before our eyes is a bunch of lies. Because religious-psychologically, it is simply impossible that the citizenry, still feeling Christian after all, even after the alleged move away from Rome of the popes, let their most venerable cult scenes slowly collapse with icy indifference. Back then, had there been *only a few thousand* citizens in the "city", they would never have let St. Peter become a cattle stable. And now, Rome was even supposed to be a world capital city with such numerous citizenry, that troops of 22000 men could be deployed! And this world city, all of a sudden, was supposed to have lost every interest in its main churches, of all things! Because after all, there was still a whole number of other, less significant churches, which, according to the already previously mentioned index, were maintained in an orderly state! Sporadic source information of course wants to make us believe that occasionally, there have been "repairs" carried out on the main churches, too; but we of course know the fabulous result of these "repairs" sufficiently: in the Lateran church and in St. Peter, or their grass-grown heaps of rubble, respectively, the cows were grazing!

It is time to again remember that we, with regards to the "city" of Rome, are operating in a chaos of tradition of mutually contradicting sources. The one side of the sources tells us: Rome, in those days, was a void, a village of cattle herders at best. The other side claims, and wants to paint us this in shiny pictures, that Rome of that epoch had supposedly been a richly populated world city. The two sides of the sources do not

[XIII] There is that literary/fiction 'style' again, with the violins in the back someplace, tiny little fiddles – yrch; and animal protection is collateral, like a mistake.

concur. The sought after truth cannot, as we have seen, lie in a neutral middle zone; it has to lie on one of the two sides. And that is, as we have seen, the description of the dilapidation side must be founded on truth, or let us put it more accurately right away: *come closest to the truth. Because both sides are falsified*. That is, the dilapidation side, too. This side of the tradition, too, brings the truth of things in a forged veil, and only through a mist, lets the truth shimmer through. Namely, the decay side describes the state *so*, as if Rome, during the course of the 14th century, had *sunk down* from a big city to a village. Thus, Rome has supposedly, by and by, *become* a village by the unstoppable decay of the once world city. But exactly this supposed decay of the alleged previous city is a lie. The truth is: *during the entire Middle Ages, Rome was only a village*. Only during the course of the 15th century, Rome has (again) become a town, in a word, the modern city of the popes.

The results of the previous investigations deliver the proof. I concisely summarise the results once more: the "factum" of the horrendous dilapidation of the christian main cult scenes in Rome has moved into the centre of our critical observation. This paper factum is, for religious-psychological reasons, as a *historical* factum impossible! Religious-psychological circumstances prove with absolute certainty that the alleged total decay of the two christian main churches, reported by the forged tradition, is a bunch of lies. After all, the alleged decay could have become possible only as a result of an absolute indifference of the back then Christians towards their most venerable cult scenes. But exactly this icy indifference is religious-psychologically impossible. In a manner of speaking, it is fivefold impossible. Had the Avignonian popes really lost all interest in an effective and successful maintenance of their holiest cult scenes – their alleged "repairs" were of course cardboard work! – the Roman clergy would then have made the effective maintenance their business. Had the clergy, too, failed comprehensively, Rome's Christians would then have rendered effective support. Had the Roman citizenry, too, comprehensively failed, then, the "crowds" of pious Rome pilgrims, and with them finally, the entire Christendom would not have allowed that their holiest locations sank to a cattle meadow. The paper "fact" of the utter ruin of St. Peter and the Lateran church is thus fivefold religious-psychologically proven to be a historical impossibility. The boundless ruin of St. Peter and the Lateran church was impossible as a historical factum *as such*. That means: never could such decay have happened historically – *if these two cult scenes* (back then already) *had existed at all*! If these cult scenes had really existed, they could, for religious-psychological reasons, never sink to rubble in the described dimensions. Thus, we have now gained but the historical quintessence of the falsified tradition with regards to the state of affairs of Rome in the Middle Ages: throughout the medieval centuries, Rome was a village, and *the alleged holy cult scenes could never decay, because they had not yet existed at all*. In other words: as late as the 14th century, Rome was a simple, insignificant herder's village, *because* back then, the cult scenes of the apostle Princes had not yet existed at all. And because these cult scenes had not yet existed, no tradition connected to their existence, that is, not the tradition of the Sedes Romana either, could have been present in the Christian consciousness in the 14th century! The mystery of the alleged exile of the church thus merges with the mystery of the town of Rome in the Middle Ages into *one* big mystery complex; and both mysteries

find one and the same solution. This solution is: during the Middle Ages, Rome has never been the residence of the "popes"; it was an insignificant village; the *city* of Rome, the city of the *popes* and the *christian cult scenes*, Rome has only become during the course of the 15th century.

I am aware that the relativistic history researchers will rebel against this result with vehemence. I also already know the usual objections with which they will come along. Their repertoire will be: the careless author has raped the sources, and squeezed them long enough for them to spill the desired result. He has artificially isolated correct observations, and brushed under the carpet all inconvenient contrary source information. The author's critique against the source information has to be rejected as unmethodical. Thus will be the points of the prosecution; but how about their justification.

From beginning to end, the accusation collapses unsupported; why, it cannot even be raised, because it does not match the facts. Namely, I have by no means raped, squeezed or isolated the sources, and on the other hand, my critique has reached its result by the guideline of the tightest methodology. For reasons explained multiple times, I have indeed not delved into relativistic swing-methodology; after all, I do not want to bring to light relative pseudo-truth of course, but investigate the historical truth in its final, absolute form. For this purpose, I have examined the source information first of all for their essential content, simply for the principle, for the core of their statement. In doing so, a stark dualism of the source statements emerged; a wedge of contradiction, as we have seen, split the sources into two halves that could not be brought to concurrence. Relativistic quasi-methodology now uses its ambition to accomplish the impossible nonetheless, and labours – naturally, in vain – distilling some sense out of the mutually contradicting sources. In the process now, the relativists commit to raping the stubborn sources in a fashion that is something else altogether! Of what the relativists accuse me, is what especially they indulge in to heart's content: to rape, press or isolate the sources, or brush them under the carpet. They cannot but proceed violently, because without brutality and ignoring inconvenient sides of the tradition, the mutually contradicting statements do not give away any sense. I, on the other hand, do not even need to rape and isolate the sources at all. My observation simply aims at the essential, the core point of all source statements, I always look for the Archimedean point in the (falsified) tradition. In our case, this Archimedean point consists of the paper factum of Rome's boundless dilapidation, namely the alleged total ruin of the holiest cult scenes of Rome and Christianity. Without raping or artificially isolating sources, this very factum quite carefreely emerges to any observer as the *essential* of all statements. I then turn my whole critical attention to this core. The core, however, in its most concentrated form, offers to us nothing but – a *paper* factum! The big question now immediately raises up: can this paper factum be viewed and accepted as a *historical* factum? Since we are of course on the territory of *falsified* tradition, this consideration is not only permissible, but unconditionally necessary. So, the paper factum is being examined for its historical essence of truth; and this is achieved by me now stepping out of the paper source chaos, and appealing to the living experience as a judge. By the experience, I examine the *possibility* of the paper factum. Behind each paper factum, we *can* and *must* form

the mental image of the human beings who once put the alleged factum into practice. Everything depends on the psychology of these living human beings as factors. From the psychology of the human beings of that epoch, is the factum in question explainable? – This is the central point of our investigation. Those human beings were Christians: so, we must delve in Christian psychology. The result of the thus conducted religious-psychological investigation, however, turned out the sheer impossibility of the paper factum being a historical factum. From this established impossibility, as a final result followed necessarily: Rome has been a village during the entire Middle Ages – in this village, before the 15th century, there were no cult scenes of the apostle Princes yet, either – because a *city* Rome has only formed in the 15th century.

Nothing can stand up against our general result, based on the core of the paper tradition, and reinforced by the living experience. No matter how much written-on parchment the historians may produce in order to put up paper "counter-proof": with the recognised impossibility of the main paper factum being a historical event, the falsified tradition is proven to be worthless waste paper. "But listen", the relativists shout, "that back then, Rome really was a major city, the well-known revolution of Cola di Rienzo alone proves!" Regrettably, the beautiful story of this "hero player in the ragged purple of antiquity" proves nothing at all with regards to the state of Rome in those days. *Because Cola di Rienzo is an entirely made-up person*. His "story" is a dramatic fairy tale, made up beginning to end! In another place, I will report in more detail on this tragicomedy. Left for me here is only to confront another objection. This objection will come from the *archaeological* side.

In *The Falsification of German History*, I have already dropped hints about *archaeological* forgeries. When the falsification leadership began implementing into reality their plan of newly creating the entire tradition of the Middle Ages according to their tendency, they were clear about having not only to forge in parchment, but in stone and earth, too. In order to not completely veer off the chosen direction of the conduct of proof, I cannot, not even at this point, either, incorporate into the discussion the archaeological problem complex in all necessary thoroughness. I have to still console the reader with a view on a later extra book. For the time being, the investigations of the literary half of the tradition will have to stand the ground. In order to remove the obstacle of the "factually", certainly according to archaeological findings, "in the entire Middle Ages existing churches Lateran and St. Peter", the following hint must suffice.

So, at the end of the 14th century to Rome, which, according to Martin V.'s (1417-1431) biographer, "barely had the form of a town" (P., p 167) – i.e. as a "town", was still stuck in its beginnings back then – one pointed at two grass-grown ruins, and told the amazed Roman cattle herders: these here are the remains of the once highly revered church in the Lateran – and those there are the leftovers of the old venerable basilica of St. Peter! Like I said, our Roman cattle herders were wondering, but what would they have to object against two piles of rubble being denoted to them in that way? Eventually, they nodded their heads, and said: yes, it is so. After all, nothing was easier in those times than to give two Roman ruins names! For nobody was less familiar with the old ruins than the Romans! "Petrarca blushed over the deep ignorance of the Romans; he

found that Rome was nowhere known as little as in Rome itself." (G., p 206) So, in the same way as there is nothing easier to give an unknown thing a name, the fathers of the action could thus unhesitatingly denote two heaps of ruins to the Romans and the world as the – regrettably, so horribly dilapidated by the long absence of the popes – christian main churches. Why, even today, the "tradition" knows to report of a stair in the chapel on the place before the Lateran, the scala santa, that it had been the stair before the house of Pilate in Jerusalem, across which Christ began his Passion. Really, nothing is easier than to pin a name on an unknown thing, and be it even of stone.

But, the archaeologists now interject, during the demolition of the old Peter's church under Martin V., in and under the decayed masonry, one has found, amongst others, inscription stones, which are "indubitably" of old Christian origin. Erbes has already commented in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* [*Magazine for Church History*], Vol. 7, p 15: "Before we examine them individually, we still must admit yet what unfitting material of evidence an inscription is, which could easily have been dragged along from any old place." With this, Erbes may not have thought of the fathers of the falsification action, but we are thinking quite lively of these people! For them now, another occupation was also child's play: to simply newly produce, i.e. forge, such inscription stones! In other words: the *literary* forgeries had to be reinforced by *archaeological* forgeries, and they have been supported by stone and earth to a prominent degree, too.

It stands, that nothing can fight against the religious-psychological general result, neither forged writing on parchment, nor on stone. Standing on the Archimedean point of our general result, we are in a position to unhinge all falsified tradition with regards to the supposed state of the "world capital city" Rome in the Middle Ages.

I dare claim: a geometrical proof could be no more sharp or conclusive than the above religious-psychological conduct of proof. Because I, too, assume one axiom: the axiom of the catholic faith, the way it has found its expression in the tradition of the Sedes Romana. With the necessity of a logical deduction, the proclaimed religious-psychological proof follows from that axiom.

4. The mystery of the medieval Heretics

If, during the Middle Ages, Rome was an insignificant and almost unknown village; if the apostle churches to Rome, and, in connection with this, the tradition of the papal Sedes Romana, originated only towards the end of the 14th century; if, on the other hand, the residence of the popes in the 14th century to Avignon essentially represents a genuinely historical fact – – then have perhaps the popes resided to Avignon also during the entire Middle Ages?? The reader has raised this question once before. I now answer it with a 'no'! But where in all the world should the popes then have had their seat of residence during the medieval centuries?, the reader shouts with justified amazement. For the time being, at this point, I make at least the one comment so as to not keep the reader in suspense: the core of the emerging mystery lies in the definition of the term "popes". Consider this: if during the Middle Ages, there was no tradition of a Sedes Romana (simply because there was no burial place of the apostle Prince Peter in Rome), could then the tradition of the apostle succession of the Roman bishop have even existed at all? Short and sweet: in the Middle Ages, can there have been chief herders of the church in a monarchic sense, can there have been "popes"? Sure, medieval "history" patronises us on thousands of pages of parchment, that, and how, the hierarchical top position of the "popes" had "historically" developed from the position of the Roman bishop as Peter's successor; but unfortunately, as we know, medieval history is falsified from the ground up, and therefore, the most unreliable and most incredible witness for the real origin of popedom. But how has modern popedom *really* formed? Since when have there been monarchic chief herders of the "general" church, since when have there been popes? That is the question. By covering another short, necessary detour, we will find the answer to this question, too. The necessary detour, however, consists of the critical discussion of the medieval history of the Heretics[XIV], which we will now enter.

It is known to anybody educated, that in the Middle Ages, there have been Heretics [Ger.: 'Ketzer']. As Heretics, those were stigmatised who discussed religious views that contradicted the once and for all by the catholic church established (defined) essential doctrine. Thus, Heresy basically always meant opposition against Rome. The ruling church declared the act of Heresy a crime against the through Christ in his church incarnated divine world order, which was to be atoned by the destruction of the criminal Heretic. As is known, it was the task of the secular arm to execute the verdict.

General information on the medieval Heretics

If we dive into the history of the Heretics the way it is presented to us in the falsified tradition, what immediately strikes us is the exceedingly frequent occurrence of Heresy, and a coloured, patchwork-like difference of origin of the Heretic groups stepping forth in the later Middle Ages. From the 10th century onwards, in each epoch and everywhere, we bump into more or less extended Heretics' nests within the

[XIV] The 'Heretics' referred to in this Book are strictly the ones as defined a little below by Kammeier, i.e. opposition against Rome's Christianity; no potentially different definition of the word 'Heretic' applies here.

christian world. So, in the last centuries of the Middle Ages, Heresy does not perhaps appear as a sporadic occurrence, but as an equally necessary affair of the broad masses, as an ongoing specific state of mind of Christendom as such back then, bursting out with persistence again and again. One imagines to be confronted with an enormous, peculiar, religious flood, which billows to and fro, up and down, and which often threatens to shake the official church in its foundations. It is an exceedingly difficult task to draw borderlines in this billowing sea of Heresy, which separate the individual "sects" from each other, and which allow to recognise them as spiritually wilfully designed parts of the whole thing. The sources gratuitously offer Heretics' names as well as Heretic teachings; however, if we, based on the source reports, attempt to point out a certain "sect" as a separate organism, we very soon bump into peculiar difficulties. These sources play a droll game with the oh, so seriously researching historian. There is the one source telling him: I will now tell you about the sect X – and then, what it tells is in reality about sect Y! Later, the reader will have still presented to them examples of this peculiar behaviour of the medieval Heretics' sources. Naturally, the serious history researchers would not suffer such pranks by the unruly sources. Then, by decisively taking action, and by no means shying away from rape either, the researchers have yet finally – so they believe – established what the "historical truth" is with regards to the medieval Heresy. Let us have it told to us what the historians have thus found out.

One big family of Heretics, we are patronised, was known under the name: the Cathars in the Middle Ages. Other names for this sect were for example: Patarines, Publicans, Runcarians and (in France) Albigensians. These Cathars, the "pure ones", were also Christians, but Christians in *their* way, and according to *their* views of Christianity. These "new Manichaeans" supposedly represented gnostic views on the root cause of evil. So, they proclaimed: "Christ is subordinate to God, and can, since matter has its origin in the demi-urge or evil principle, have no truly human body, but only a pseudo-body, so that he has not really suffered, died and resurrected."[9] So, *all* Cathars believed thus? Oh no! Others achieved different results with their speculations. For example, John of Lugio has supposedly taught that Christ had taken on a truly human body yet. Some Cathars considered Christ a simple human being, others, on the other hand, an angel-turned-human. (H., p 65) So, as the reader can see, the Cathars went by no means along with each other in their speculative dogmas. These Heretics appeared unified only in the general opposition against the catholic church. The Cathars overall declared that the catholic church is not the right church of Christ, and its priests are not the right administrators of the sacraments. Therefore, they rejected the sacraments of the false church, and put own sacraments in their place, such as laying on hands (the so-called consolamentum or the "consolation") and the blessing of the bread. Concerning the external installations of the official church, they declared themselves to be against all clerical customs which belonged to the cult, against pomp, holy water, crosses, pilgrimage. Nor did they accept any saints, and they rejected the so-called tradition (quotes and explanations of the church fathers), because they held the opinion that the teachings of Christ and the apostles suffice for the attainment of salvation. Their sharpest opposition turned against the Roman priesthood, against episcopate and the pope. Because this Roman priest church had supposedly fallen off the true gospel of Christ, that is why it had all obedience refused by the true Christians, exactly – by the Cathars. Amongst the members

of the sect, by the way, there were two classes: 1. the *Perfecti* or the perfect ones, 2. the *Credentes* or the still imperfect ones, i.e. the common believers. This distinction took place after the achieved degree of penetration into the spirit of the Cathar dogmas. About the imperfect ones now, something very remarkable is being reported: *namely, as much as before, they still externally supported the so hated Roman church*! "The believers came into the catholic churches, participated in all customary ceremonies, and did not betray by anything the fact that internally, they no longer belonged to catholicism. Externally, a separation from the Roman church had not at all taken place."[10] Not only the Cathars, the Waldensians, too, of whom talk will be momentarily, thus externally remained in the lap of the catholic church. At least temporarily it was handled that way, the sources report. Why? For the obvious reason: namely, by such camouflage of their "true" views, the Cathars attempted to evade access by the inquisition.

We come to the second main group of the late medieval Heretics, the Waldensians (also called the Leonists, or the Poor of Lyon).

On the origin of this sect, quite unclear and mutually contradicting reports are handed down. We will still get back to them in a critical observation. The amongst the relativists ruling opinion goes in the direction, that in the year 1177 or 1178, a rich citizen to Lyon, Peter Waldo (Waldus, Waldes), has supposedly brought to life the Waldensian sect. Waldo had supposedly, by zealous reading of the biblical books, arrived at giving away his entire fortune to the poor, and, furthermore living in gospel-like poverty, to preach to the people the unadulterated gospel of Christ. We cannot wait now to hear, just what views Waldo's followers and successors proclaimed on faith and life conduct of a true successor of Christ – and we are fairly surprised to hear, by and large, the already known views of the Cathars. The Waldensians, too, saw in the New Testament the foundation of the faith, and they may not have abandoned, unlike the Cathars, the Old Testament altogether; yet, they have "neglected it besides occasional places of proof". Like the Cathars, they declared themselves to be against the worship of saints, the holy wafer and the admiration of the cross. "They wanted to know nothing of pompous houses of God, of valuable church ornate and church equipment, of lights, images and art singing… as valuable, nothing was left but the script observation and prayer, baptism, holy communion and confession." (H. 4, p 905) Exactly like with the Cathars, we find with the Waldensian group the distinction of their members into Perfecti and Credentes. And of these Waldensian Credentes, too, it is reported that they had supposedly not externally separated from the hostile official church; at least not during the first time after the foundation of their community, and then, again, not in the last century of the Middle Ages.[11] Thus, temporarily, even the common believers supposedly stayed away from the catholic church, especially its sacrament administration. At any rate, the sub groups of the big Waldensian sect were characterised by great differences of opinion in many things, even with regards to important statements of faith. But of what then did the essentially new consist, that Peter Waldo and his successors wanted to bring to Christianity? According to two significant researchers, Dieckhoff und K Müller, the novel consisted of Waldo creating a *class of lay preachers* independent from the catholic church. "In this free predicant-dom, we have to recognise the actual

donation of Peter Waldo, and at the same time, recognise the peculiar-new that followed the appearance of the former [the predicant-dom]."[12] Now, in reality, such lay-preacherdom of the Waldensians by no means represents anything peculiar-new, because for a long time already, the Cathars had sent their apostolic lay preachers through the lands. K Müller, who in one place also expresses himself about "relations between Cathars and Waldensians", says it himself, too: "On both sides an association…, calling themselves brothers and sisters, as successors to the apostles, poor and without possessions, moving from place to place, and spiritually providing for their friends in instruction and confession." (M., p 136) Waldo and his associates must have been world-removed hermits, if they could believe having created something peculiar-new with their predicant-dom. However, they did not stand for the Cathar view of the dualism of the principle of good and evil. But almost in all essential things, the Cathars, and the Waldensians said, wanted and believed the same. Despite this, with the appearance of the Waldensians, something surprising occurred in the Heretics' world: Waldensedom equally devours Cathardom.

Around the middle of the 13th century, Cathardom, this Heretics' wave, despite all persecution so mightily swelling, not only suddenly stands still, but fully ebbs off during the course of a few decades. Almost over night, all Cathars die out! They have been overtaken and soaked up by the Waldensians, research states as a "factum". "What we are facing here is the waning and extinction of a world view, which, for a while, exercised an enormous attraction. However, we are unable to follow the event in detail." (H 5^1, p 406) More accurately, it has to read: we are simply unable to comprehend the mysterious *disappearance* of Cathardom as such. What baffles me is not only the *result* of the competitive struggle between Cathars and Waldensians, but already the "fact" of such a competitive struggle in the first place. Just what did such a new Waldensian wandering apostle preach to the Cathars? Something peculiar-new? Even something better than their old belief taught them? Not at all! The Cathars heard from the new wandering apostles basically the same what their own preachers already had always proclaimed. "It is a downright shocking fact, that the same basic stock of religious ideas returns (frequently, down to the last detail) at least throughout seven centuries in all old-protestant communities [such as with the Cathars and the Waldensians; K.], may they find themselves in Spain or Hungary, in Apulia or Belgium, in the Provence or in Eastern Prussia."[13] What is shocking, like I said, is the conformity of Cathardom and Waldensedom; so, a reason for the Cathars to now, all of a sudden, deny the 'good old', did not exist at all. Certainly, the Manichaean Cathars enjoyed philosophising about the origin of evil, and then talked of the good and evil principle. But what business of the common man was such philosophical hair-splitting? For them, it made the difference what the new preachers had to proclaim for example about the sacraments, the picture and saint adoration, and about the whole hierarchical system of the hated catholic church. In all those things, however, the speech of a Waldensian preacher did not sound in the slightest different to the speech of their previous preacher. But remarkable: wherever the new predicants of the Waldensians make an appearance – in a few decades, they have eradicated Cathardom in all countries (!) off the face of the Earth. For the time being, we want to content ourselves with the plain statement of this alienating factum of the paper tradition.

Source critique on the medieval history of the Heretics.

On the sources of the history of the Heretics, it quite goes what Keller says: "There is barely an area of political and clerical history…, that is so confused and disfigured as the history of the Heretics. The sources are not only comparatively sparse, but, what is much worse, they are to the highest degree unreliable and disfigured." (K., p 12) "After the victory of the one party [the church; K.] had been decided by means of external force, the fight against the literature of the defeated party as well was opened with the same energy with which one acted against the persons. So it comes, that out of the most important periods of Waldensedom, we are almost exclusively depending on reports by their opponents." (K., p 14) This statement does not only apply to the literature relevant to the Waldensian sect, but also, yes, even more so, to the tradition of Cathardom. It is *catholic* authors, i.e. opponents of the Heretics, to whom we owe our knowledge of the Cathar sect. So, there is reporting from a party standpoint going on. Let us now suppose for a moment, the relevant catholic sources from the 12th to the 15th century were authentic as such – how would, in these "authentic" sources, the catholic party standpoint have worked out? I have said it once before in a different place (*The Historical Mysteries of the World*): the disfiguration of truth in *genuine, contemporary* descriptions has its limits[XV]. For understandable reasons, party-biased description can never indulge in unrestrained phantasy. In a manner of speaking, it goes without saying that the catholic chroniclers of that time imputed the Heretics and Heretic groups the very worst with regards to morals. It will of course not surprise us at all, when the Heretics are described by their clerical opponents as wicked villains and devil's children; what much rather surprises us to the utmost, is that these bitter enemies generally paint the picture of the Heretics so strikingly *little* in ugly colours. Not all that infrequently, even an acknowledging and admiring tone sounds out of their reports. It is thus reported that the "wicked Heretics" observed exceedingly strict fasting; furthermore: "the Heretics had only established marriage, which had been concluded between the virginal man and the virginal woman." (F., p 307/308) Such things do not exactly sound like biased degradation and insult.

Strangely, in the allegedly authentic sources, the "party standpoint" now works out "devastatingly" in a quite different respect; namely in things, which were, with a biased view, most insignificant. One such most insignificant biased thing for example, was the *name* of a group of Heretics. The names of the big Heretic sects were known to all contemporaries, and the chroniclers, too, found abundant opportunity to inquire on name designations. Because some of these reporters were not only practically active as inquisitors in Heretic circles, but had themselves once been a member of a sect, and remorsefully returned into the lap of the church. From a party standpoint, there existed no reason at all to throw dust in the eyes of their well-informed co-humans by falsely attributing to an all-known sect the name of a well-known other sect. Their contemporaries would have shaken their heads over such childish tactics, and the reporters themselves would have shaken the

[XV] Hm. Does it really? Looking at what happened during Kammeier's writing period (‘1930’s-50s), and events such as '9/11', one must wonder whether those limits may have shifted or disappeared altogether, I'd say. What's worse is that we have collectively grown stupid enough to believe everything just because it is relentlessly and endlessly repeated on all 'news' channels and other mainstream outlets around the world.

credibility of their other information in a quite stupid manner. It has to thus surprise that with the catholic chroniclers, with regards to the *names* of the most significant Heretic groups, oftentimes, the very greatest confusion and unclarity prevailed; it appears as if these reporting "contemporaries" had no right concept at all of the specific teaching opinions of the individual Heretic communities, either. Everything is being colourfully mixed up higgledy-piggledy there.

As an educational example, a medieval work, more accurately, a compilation of Heretic scripts may be presented, which is – naturally! – preserved in several recensions, which – equally naturally! – deviate from each other. The basic stock of this collection consists of the script *Summa de Chataris et Leonistis* of Rainer Sachoni. This author himself, who allegedly passed away around 1260, had belonged to the Cathars for 17 years, but has then returned into the lap of the catholic church, and later, has persecuted his former co-believers as a Dominican inquisitor. So, this chronicler had good knowledge of Heretic things from own experience, so that one should be permitted to expect particularly accurate enlightenment from his work. Unfortunately however – and it goes without saying! – the authentic, pure work of the author has been lost! "Of course, we no longer possess the book in its original form. The way the Jesuit Gretser… has first published it…, it clearly presents itself as compiled together with other scripts, and the with Martène and Durand… and with Argentré… given text is not pure, either… Recently, Preger has again discovered one of the interpolated pieces in two scripts in the Munich Court and State Library, and with certainty proven it to be the work of a Passau Anonymous from the middle of the 13th century."[14] With regards to the alleged authorship or the interpolator, we are not at all interested, what research has discovered via their blind relative method; but we are exceedingly interested in the work, or much rather, the three different recensions of the work themselves.

Flathe (ibid, p 376 f.) gives us a lively description of the content of these recensions. We want to put them here, abridged. *1. Recension* (in Martène): "The edition… starts off with the promise, that the author would like to describe two main Heretic sects, the Cathars first, who were supposedly the same as the Patarines, and the Leonists, who were supposedly the same as the Poor of Lyon. The description itself, however, only very incompletely fulfils this promise. Because only the description of the actual Cathars is given. Yes, at the end, there is something attached about the Poor of Lyon, but this something is uncommonly little contained in few lines. The Poor of Lyon are again separated into two classes, this side and beyond the mountains, the Pauperes Ultramontani and the Pauperes de Lombardia… What deserves mentioning very much is that the author labours to… justify… the difference of these two classes… which turned out very badly... What he… presents as differentiation, is conformance on the subject, so that the differentiation merely lies in the terms used. Clear is the author's intention… to justify by quite arbitrary statements… a differentiation of the sects, where there is indeed none." – *2. Recension* (in Argentré): "It follows a second… edition, which, in terms of peculiarity, still outdoes the first one. Because [there; K.] come two short essays, one about the Poor of Lyon and Lombardy, the other about the Waldensians… Reiner's intention has

obviously been to portray the Waldensians as a separate sect… He lists thirty-three counts of heresy of these Waldensians. Such a list was tied to great difficulties. The author was supposed to describe separately what after all, was but one thing yet… So, if one said, the Poor of Lyon are a separate sect, the Poor of Lombardy are one again, no less particular again the Waldensians, so something was omitted in the list of the heretic statements of the first, and added to the heresies of the others… Or, one finally reverted to plucking anything at all plain out of thin air… the author obviously tortures himself establishing a differentiation of the heresy, but he succeeds in nothing… He put the teachings of the Heretics now this way, now that way, he separated their sects this way and that way." – *3. Recension* (in Gretser): "The author tells that the seventy old Heretic sects… [have] gone under. Only the Manichaeans, the Arianians, the Runcarians and the Leonists in Germany were supposedly still left. The Cathars are not mentioned at all, and the Poor of Lyon are put under the Heretics of the old church… Else, the fifth [chapter; K.] contains nothing but a list of the errors of the Poor of Lyon, who were also called Leonists. In this, something striking is again presenting itself now. Out of the Poor of Lombardy, the author no longer forms a particular subdivision of the Poor of Lyon… He has also forgotten the Waldensians, and in this entire edition, they are altogether only mentioned in one other place in passing… One will have to… notice that in this edition, the Patarines are viewed as not entirely identical with the Cathars, but as a separate sect… The whole small piece about the Patarines looks as if somebody has made an attempt to erect something that looked like something different to Catharism, and as if, in the middle of the attempt, they felt that it would not work out, anyhow." – So, this is how colourful and glittering the three recensions appear! "What rich chain of confusion, contradiction and even silliness the whole thing offers", thus, Flathe concludes his synopsis. By the well-known habit of this medieval script flower, the readers of my earlier writings will have clearly recognised indeed, that this peculiar plant has grown on the soil of the falsification action.

Now a second example of the deliberate contradiction in the sources on the Heretics' history. We are being placed into the midst of a chaos of mutually contradicting information, when we examine the sources for how the Credentes of the Waldensians supposedly behaved towards the official church. This contradiction reveals itself in the alleged attitude of the Waldensian believers towards the sacrament administration. In this, it has to be remembered that a main reason for the Heretics to separate from the church was found in the degenerated Roman priests being unworthy of effectively administering the sacraments. "From the epistle from 1218, one… had to conclude, that the Lombards [a subgroup of the Waldensians; K.] shunned the baptism of the Roman priests, and implemented an own baptism. This is how the affair still seems to stand as well around the middle of the 13th century… as much as in the third quarter of the 13th, the German Waldensians supposedly still at the beginning of the 14th century, at least administered the Holy Communion in their congregations." Thus, the *one* side of the sources reports. And now the *other* side. "Nonetheless now, already David of Augsburg [around 1250; K.] reports that the friends [Credentes; K.] of the Waldensians participate in all divine service acts of the Roman church, even in the sacraments, confess to the priests, and also observe the clerical statutes, of course only in order to protect themselves from being uncovered. We hear

the exactly same from the Passau Anonymous." (M., p 116/117) Once again, the reader can here see the tactics of the deliberate contradiction and the hush-hush being deployed. *Why* the medieval Heretics' history *had to be* confused and darkened under any circumstances, on that, we will gain complete clarity towards the end of this Book.

Just how it stands with the sources about the Heretics' history, an examination of the alleged *origin of the Waldensian sect* shall offer to us as the last example.

Today, research generally assumes as fully secured, that the by us already mentioned Peter Waldo from Lyon supposedly has brought to life Waldensedom. "The foundation of the sect by Waldo is so unconditionally certain, that it is currently no longer being denied by anybody capable of judgement." (M., p 3) I am quite easily permitted to count myself as well amongst the ones capable of judgement, and yet: I deny the origin and the foundation of this sect by Waldo! Why I deny this, will now be explained. I must still remark that the Waldensians themselves, at all times, have vehemently raised objections against the assumption of the foundation by Waldo. They reference the tradition written down in their literature. However, with this literature now, things do not stand very well; as Dieckhoff has proven, the Waldensian scripts carry unmistakeable traces of falsification. This falsification, which originates from the circles of the Waldensians themselves, has taken place in order to rouse the impression that the Waldensians had, *even before Luther*, proclaimed the true evangelical faith. This need not worry us at this point. We leave the Waldensian literature by the side altogether, and take a look at the medieval *catholic* sources, of which Dieckhoff reckons that they deserve full trust, since they, "in the main things, formidably" concur.

On the conversion story of this alleged founder Waldo, two contemporary sources report, that have allegedly been written around 30 years after Waldo's death: Stephen of Bourbon (or Borbon), and the *Chronikon Laudens*… The latter report is supposedly a little older perhaps, "but it is no more valuable; because it has been clipped novelistically". With regards to the information of both reports, research now has found out that they do *not* concur in their stance. "What is a sudden conversion according to the chronicle, is, according to Stephen, a gradual development: that cannot be reconciled." (H. IV, p 897) That does not exactly sound like concurring "in the main things, formidably"; because especially on the main things, the reports deviate. Moving on. Waldo and his first associates have supposedly been driven away from Lyon by the Lyon archbishop John shortly "before a Lateran council", as the named Stephen tells. This council can "be only the one from 1179, and therefore, the expulsio[XVI] [the driving out; K.] must have occurred before 1179. However, archbishop John of Lyon now reigns only 1181-1195. Thus, Stephen must have met a mistake of sorts". (M., p 9) How it stands with this "mistake" in truth, however, we can see from the fact that in the preserved scripts, the tactics of elastic dating have been deployed. One script fixes the foundation of the sect "around the year 1170", another to the year 1180. We could think that perhaps our Stephen did not have any options to

[XVI] the 'n' at the end of 'expulsio' is missing, because the Latin term was used here

accurately inform himself on events and names, and then, "mistakes" would at least be understandable. But to the contrary: Stephen could very accurately inform himself, right there, and in person! For in the year 1223, Stephen was in Lyon himself, so we learn, and he has been in touch with Waldo's, back then, still living associates. Regrettably however, despite investigation at the best source, our chronicler was unable to even establish town-wide known things; such as, for example, the government entrance of the archbishop John! Such ignorance of medieval "contemporaries" on easily researchable, all-known "contemporary" names and events has met my readers every step along the way; after the treatises of my previous writings, we also know on what such fabulous ignorance is founded. At the Lateran council from 1179, Waldensians from Lyon have supposedly also appeared, in order to justify their doings before the pope. Again, contradictions in the reports appear. "On the Waldensians on the 3rd Lateran synod, the reports do not concur. According to the chronicle of Lyon, Waldo himself was present; that is incorrect, because Walter Map [another alleged contemporary; K.], who in 1179, had negotiated with two of them [the Waldensians], only mentions… simply Waldensians [says nothing of any presence of Waldo; K.]." (H. IV, p 898) The by Dieckhoff claimed concurrence of the sources "on the main points" thus reveals itself every time as a contradiction especially on the main points.

We want to still continue watching our "well-informed" Stephen at work a little. After all, right there and then, he has procured the knowledge of the back then customary Waldensedom. His description of the French Waldensedom now is equally interesting and stunning. In doing so, he closely touches with another source, namely an anonymous record in Martène and Durand. "A quite peculiar description of the Waldensians is found in both works [of Stephen and the Anonymous; K.]. The two sources stem from France; but they give a picture that does not match the else (!) handed-down one on the French Waldensians, much rather contains elements that else, are partly not reported on the Waldensians at all (!!), partly especially not on the French, but the Lombardy department of the sect, especially their Austrian branch." (M., p 166)

So, this is how "reliable" and "concurring" the "indubitably genuine" reports of the catholic authors on the medieval sect phenomenon look!

Now, what especially concerns the foundation of the Waldensian sect by a Lyon citizen Waldo, this much is to say: that this alleged sect founder is a totally made up person. This assumption is already being suggested by the just sketched general finding of the falsified Heretics' tradition. After all, obviously, the endeavour of the reporters aims at imputing the opponents of the catholic hierarchy any random "heresies" in terms of faith and the life circumstances, with the intent of veiling for posterity the actual, true nature of medieval Hereticdom. The invention of the personality of a Peter Waldo, however, also follows from particular points of the falsified tradition. We are primarily startled by the circumstance, that the alleged founder, after his first appearance, no longer appears to be extant and influential at all in history. What has become of him, where he lived later on, where he died – he is rumoured to have died "around 1217" – all these circumstances are unknown, or are fully mythical, respectively, as research, too, had to concede. But already Flathe remarks with justification: "Had a very big society of Heretics owed him its origin, then, data

of his life would probably have survived, as much as of other Heretiarchs." (F., p 267) Quite certainly even, such data of Waldo's further life would have survived. Let us just think of Stephen of Bourbon once again. In his investigations in Lyon a few decades after Waldo's supposed death, Stephen should have established with ease further main dates from his [Waldo's] life, and placed them in his writing, which oh, so "accurately" describes the conversion story. But perhaps Stephen did not have any particular interest in Waldo's later life circumstances. Then again, there were other people who were most interested in such things; namely, the Waldensians themselves! Had Waldo founded their sect, then it is certain: his memory, his entire curriculum vitae, at least in the main dates and events, would have been reliably stored in the memory of the believers, and been handed down by them over decades and centuries. But especially the Waldensians themselves know nothing of a founder Waldo, and have always resisted the alleged foundation by a Waldo. Why should they so stubbornly deny their founder, if he had existed? This is connected to the purposeful falsification of their own literature, it is said. Via their falsified literature, the Waldensians wanted to rouse the impression that they had already, throughout centuries, been Protestants, that they had already proclaimed the pure gospel long before Luther. Well now, they could have claimed that *without denying their one-time founder*! Because Waldo has supposedly lived in the 12th century, and if the Waldensians conceded to the foundation by this Waldo, nothing of their claim, that their genuinely evangelical community had already existed centuries before Luther, was threatened and weakened. To the contrary, especially a hint on their foundation by the "well-known Peter Waldo from the 12th century" would have given significant weight to their claim of the century-long existence of their sect before the reformation. If, however, they shifted their origin into the general-unknown – despite having a historical Waldo – then, they themselves, quite unnecessarily and right from the start, aroused justified doubts in their claims. But the Waldensians now really did not know of a founder Waldo, and so they had to, willingly or not, shift their origin into the temporally unknown.

In a script from as late as the year 1395, whose author is Petrus of Pilichdorf, for the first time, the news appears that this Waldo's first name had supposedly been Peter. Dieckhoff also reckons that this name be well mythical. (D., p 342) But this Pilichdorf also knows of something mythical to report, namely: this Peter had supposedly received his name after a mythical place 'Walden' or 'Waldo', "situated on France's border". What's more, Pilichdorf never calls his Peter 'Waldus' or 'Waldo', but always Petrus Waldensis, that is, Peter of the Waldensians! Thus, the result is: somebody, who in the year 1395, writes about the Waldensians, therefore, has yet also made inquiries on the sect and its "founder", learns about him – fairy tale things! Or, much rather: invents fairy tale things about him! So, as early as back then, the Waldensians must have denied their founder – or so at least all of his true life data – despite in such early times, no reason at all existed to re-forge their own literature in a dogmatic-reformatory sense.

It is not necessary to take still further critical source samples, in order to recognise that the late medieval Heretics' history has been falsified. The general characteristic of all falsified tradition: the deliberate contradiction and the deliberate rumourous murkiness clearly emerges to daylight already in these few

examples. Right from the beginning, by the way, these characteristic falsification findings were to be expected in the Heretics' history; because with regards to the Heretic tradition, we are in the well-known sphere of the falsified medieval "history" as such. That the entire "history" of the Middle Ages – i.e. also including the Heretics' history – has been systematically falsified, I have irrefutably demonstrated with around a dozen main proofs in my previous works. Our critical examination of the sources of the late medieval Hereticdom has thus only newly strengthened the already established result. However, we must not content ourselves with such general confirmation. Namely, the critical main work on the Heretics' history has not at all been tackled by us so far; it is awaiting yet. Only in the following chapter will the actual *central problem* of the Heretics' history be laid bare and subjected to a critical procedure.

At this point, only one more preliminary and side question: if the history of Hereticdom has been taken under correction by the fathers of the action, how deeply do the falsification threads and hearths stretch right into the mass of the tradition? To put it briefly: the falsification in the area of the Heretic's history goes down to the core of things. All apparel of the Heretic tradition consists of falsification layers, only the core contains historical truth. Historically true with regards to the entire medieval Heretics' history is only, *that in the late Middle Ages, Heretics did actually exist*, namely people who stood in opposition to the official church. But all that, which is reported in the sources about the existing Heretics' communities, about their groups and classification, about their origin and names, about their customs and teaching opinions, represents an inextricable bundle of truth and fiction. The fathers of the action had weighty reasons to throw dust into posterity's eyes about the true nature of Hereticdom; yes, I am permitted to hint at more here already: the main cause of the falsification action lay in the necessity to primarily remove from the world especially the true Heretics' history, and in its stead, smuggle in a purpose-conform, falsified tradition.

5. The critical central problem of the Heretics' history

I will now lay bare the central problem of the medieval Heretics' tradition. In order to penetrate through to it, we now steer our attention to the *dissemination* of the Heretics in the Middle Ages.

The uninstructed reader imagines the protestation against the ruling catholic church, Hereticdom, to be occasional individual phenomena in the religious life of the Middle Ages. Their amazement is justified, when they get to hear of the enormous spread of Heresy and the monstrous number of Heretics. Let us once have the researchers tell us, what they have extracted from the sources about the dissemination of Heresy.

"The opposition (Heresy and church) was extant in the whole christian world, albeit not in equal strength. In the beginning of the 13th century in the South, the flood of Cathardom billowed and surged mightier than ever before: it filled the towns of Italy, especially Lombardy, it was supermighty in the Provence, and disseminated from there, radiating far across the French lands." (H. IV, p 887/888) Within Germany in the 12th century, too, we meet Cathardom "here and there". "Not only in the whole of France, but everywhere in the towns of Brabant, they [the Cathars; K.] could supposedly be found." (ibid, p 889) Particularly in the Rhein areas and in Southern Germany, their traces are provable in the sources since the beginning of the 13th century. "Simultaneous history writers report in terror of the great number of these priest opponents, so namely around the year 1200, the Augustinian William in his English history: there are supposedly entire lands in France, Spain, Italy and Germany, where there are that many people infected by the plague of Heresy, that one could believe they are more numerous than the sand by the sea."[15]

Then, as we have already heard, the *Waldensians* stepped into the footsteps of the Cathars. And like previously the Cathars, so now the Waldensians, too, established for themselves core centres of their effectiveness in Southern France and Upper Italy (Lombardy). In Germany, one notices the "new" Heretics first, and especially again in the South and by the Rhein. "In the town of Trier, they had [around 1230; K.] no less than three "schools"… On the Upper Rhein, they had in Strasbourg a main seat, but they were spread across the entire Alsace. In 1211 in Strasbourg, approximately eighty companions were… burnt. In Bavaria, they were found everywhere: in the middle of the 13th century in the diocese of Passau, Waldensian circles existed in more than forty localities." (H. IV, p 901/902) In the Southeast of the Empire, "their number was big enough for them to organise as a secret church. Waldensian "scholae" existed in twelve different places… All, man and woman… be untiring in teaching and learning; supposedly, if one has been a student for as long as only a week, they already look for another to instruct them." (ibid, V[1], p 398) Back then in the Dukedom of Austria, the number of Waldensians was estimated to be over 80.000! (ibid, p 400) In Bohemia and Moravia, the amount of Heretics was "barely countable". But not yet enough of this. Because we hear that outside the Waldensian main group, separate sects still existed in many places. So for example in Germany, there were numerous followers of the *Sect of the Free Spirit*. More than anything, the so-called *Beguines* and *Beghards* made the flood of Hereticdom swell further still. The Beguines were, as the falsified sources want to make us believe, "ascetic females, who… lived… according to the customs of the nuns, but without a binding vow." Trigger for the foundation of the Beguine houses was supposedly the circumstance that "the rush on the nun convents" was so great[XVII] that it could not be satisfied by the existing convents, and created new forms for itself."[16] Again, this is how the sources picture the cause and the nature of Beguine- and Beghardom. In reality, however, as Keller rightfully stresses, there is "barely an area that is darker than the history of these Beghards (and Beguines)". Only once, just one time, we are to imagine such a society of *voluntarily* in ascesis *co-habiting* women! To us, it is only interesting here, that very soon after the harmless foundation of their

[XVII] ... that I had to laugh out loud; that rush was probably less strong than the ones in Peru and Tokyo last month – imperceptible, if even extant. It's that 'style' again that gives those falsifiers away almost every time.

voluntary ascesis clubs, the church-pious Beguines and Beghards came under suspicion of Heresy, and became subject to the inquisition! Especially Emperor Charles IV. much concerned himself with the extermination of the Heretic Beghards. "The Emperor glorifies about Kerlinger [an inquisitor; K.], that he has supposedly annihilated the sect of the Beguines and Beghards in the church provinces Magdeburg and Bremen, in Thuringia, Saxony and Hessen."[17] So, these ascetic men and women, too, still further fill the already so considerable contingent of the Heretics. "In the year 1318, bishop John of Strasbourg estimated the total number of Beguines in Germany at over 200.000." (H. V[1], p 426)

In the face of such enormous masses of Heretics in the late Middle Ages, we wonder amazed and doubting: *but where then was the Roman church back then*?! Was it even still there? It was probably really still there, because it has proven most lively and affectionate, and it has persecuted and burned the Heretics with much zeal, when and where it could lay its hands on them.

So, as the sources proclaim to us, in the late Middle Ages, Hereticdom was in a state of enormous dissemination throughout all of Europe. May the falsified sources now, about the name designations and dogmas of these Heretics, serve up to us no matter how many lies, there can be no doubt about the naked historical fact, that Heretics as opponents of Rome existed in monstrous masses back then. And yet, I come to a claim now, which, at this point and without further explanation, sounds downright monstrous: *it is impossible that in the late Middle Ages, such a monstrous number of opponents of Rome could even have lived*! I declare the existence of such widespread masses of Heretics for outright impossible!

If the reader now shouts at me: but that is a contradiction! Something is not right here! Once it is declared that there can be no doubt about the historical existence of these masses of Heretics, and right after, the exact opposite is claimed – I then very much understand their justified displeasure. But I kindly ask them to still practice a little patience. In the following, the so drastic appearing contradiction will dissolve in an as much unexpected as simple way. The reader now finds themselves thrown into the midst of a problem, the critical central problem of the whole Heretics' history. A problem emerges, of whose existence traditional research had no concept at all so far. The existence of the Heretics gives us by the plain existence this big problem; because the described mass-like existence of Heretics in the late Middle Ages really represents an enigma.

The central problem of the Heretics' history lies rooted in the question: *is it possible that in the Middle Ages, Heresy could spread and multiply to the described extent*? In order to answer this question, we have to realise the life of the Heretics, and the measures taken by the church against Hereticdom.

Everybody knows that as early as during the Middle Ages, the catholic church was by no means intent on letting a human being, living in their sphere of power, find salvation in their own fashion. A Ketzer, a Heretic, can therefore not only not find salvation outside of the church, but they also represent a great danger for the orthodox [folks] and thus for the survival of the exclusively bliss-donating church. Amicably or with

violence, the church must, according to its "divine order", lead such apostates back to the right faith, or annihilate them. All-known of course is the institution of the *inquisition*; all-known also, that the workings of this institution, in the majority of the cases, resulted in the rendering harmless – incarceration and burning – of the false believers. Popes and secular Firsts found together, both equally zealous to burn out the dangerous plague boil of Heresy.

Let us have a look at some papal decrees against Hereticdom. One such decree from the year 1184 orders: "Every archbishop or bishop or…in their stead, another suitable, honourable personality shall once to twice every year visit the parishes of which it is known by rumours that Heretics live there. There, they shall keep under oath three or more reputable, certified men[XVIII]… to report… Heretics known to them, or such who visit dark conventicles, or deviate from the common belief in their life conduct, to the bishop… who will then summon the named ones before him."[18] Another decree rules: "In the individual parishes in- and outside of a town, the archbishops and bishops must oblige by oath a priest and one, two, three… well reputable laymen, who zealously and repeatedly investigate Heretics, search suspicious houses, underground facilities or secret abodes, which shall then be destroyed." Next is pope Innocenz III.: "Nobody let themselves be misguided by false compassion [with the Heretics; K.]. Even the orthodox children of a Heretic must be robbed of their possessions, reigning Princes themselves must be forced to confiscate the goods of a Heretic; the house which harboured a Heretic, must be torn down… Trust and good faith does not have to be kept towards a Heretic, and the fraud, practised against him, will be hallowed."[XIX] (F., p 398)

We have to admit: these decrees attest to a vice squad talent in sniffing out Heretics. There is a method in the search instructions. Now, the reader is to picture these decrees implemented and executed into the practice of real life. They are to intensely picture the workings of the inquisition and its helpers' helpers in a suspicious locality. Mentally, they are to accompany the track-hounds of the inquisition in their scouting of Heretics, and the spying around the ones under suspicion of Heresy. They are finally to realise the punishment and the gruesome fate not only of the convicted Heretic, but also that of their whole family. When the reader has thought all of this over, they will recognise for themselves the problem at hand, namely: just how has it been possible that in the face of the described situation, despite the most finicky criminological preparations, and despite all the terrible punishments, Heresy could have spread to this monstrous extent?

Again, I have to break the tip off an interjection that could be raised. This interjection is that the question for the possibility of the monstrous spread of Heresy is impermissible, because history of course proves that Hereticdom has indeed taken such an enormous boom. In this interjection however, lies a bad, false conclusion. History is supposed to prove that Heresy has "really" grown that strongly? Which history?

[XVIII] This sounds like from the manual for the old freemasonry btw (almost identical to the immediately next item, another decree)…

[XIX] … and this like something from the Talmud – what a connection, smack – on the nose! And best of all: these sources, falsified or not, have popes attest to it for posterity! History IS fun with the right books.

The history of the Middle Ages? But this "history" is of course *falsified*! This alleged "history" is of course nothing but a falsified paper tradition! And because medieval history, the way it is preserved in the sources, is not at all the untouched result of historical events, but represents an artificial fabrication, that is why our question is not only permissible, but, in the interest of finding the truth, unconditionally required.

Has the reader previously tried to picture the workings of the inquisitors, I now ask them to accompany in thought a wandering apostle on their advertisement march. A Waldensian messenger of faith for example arrives in a town there, in order to recruit new companions for their protestant faith. They must not act openly and freely. The clergy and the town authorities have a watchful eye for such mysterious, strange people. In all secrecy and with the greatest caution, the wandering apostle must approach a citizen or a family. "Even disguised as traders, the faith messengers wander around… When they are now perhaps asked whether they had not maybe other things to sell, too: then they say, they do have something, more delicious than any precious stones, only, one must promise to not betray them. But to them, the delicious is the gospel." (F., p 257) So, one has to supposedly promise not to betray them! The promise as such was easy to make; but if now the upright citizen noticed what the "delicious" was leading to? Behind the delicious, he saw the stake flickering. And one was subjected to the inquisition merely for silently listening to a Heretic, or inviting them to one's house. Mortal fear will have driven the citizen to showing the dangerous stranger the door; and when it was left at that, the wandering apostle could count himself lucky. However, a fully frightened one hastily ran to the rectory, and there reported what they had just met. Such wandering apostle would in reality not have remained unchallenged for very long; sooner or later, the inquisition would have put a stop to their practices. If we now read "contemporary" source reports about the advertisement methods of the messengers of faith, we are plain dumbfounded, with what carelessness and open-heartedness the apostles supposedly proceeded – without falling into the hands of the inquisition. "Contemporary" David of Augsburg (Ivonetus) narrates: "They teach the gospel to little girls (!)… like to visit gullible and ignorant people… He [the messenger of faith; K.] bids to keep everything a secret, and not to tell anyone. They degrade the clergy and make them [the priests; K.] so hated, that one neither believes nor follows them… They recommend to not offer… any alms, tithe [tenth]… by saying that the clergy had ordered all these… only for their advantage." (H. II, p 294)

The prospect of winning new followers for the Heretic faith was, with the terrible consequences for both the advertiser as well the gained companion, infinitely small. Naturally, one cannot make out the gaining of a "believer" to be completely impossible. Now and then and here and there once, the efforts of a wandering preacher might have thus really – if they had the unlikely luck to overreach the track-hounds of the inquisition for a longer period of time – be crowned by a small success. So, let us once suppose the unlikely, that a messenger of faith could have delivered their conversion sermon in some families of the place unchallenged, and they really had won some newly converted for their sect. In what kind of position, however, did the new companions find themselves now? They were now Heretics! That means: from that hour forth, their life was no longer safe for one moment. Danger was lurking everywhere. Their entire thinking was certainly intent on

"keeping in the secret" the dangerous fact of their Hereticdom. But such "secrecy" was infinitely difficult, and potentially even directly attracted the suspicion. Why are they acting so secretly?, the nosy neighbour wives asked. It was not at all possible to constantly, before friend and foe, act so skilfully, that no discovery of their secrecy would threaten. The constant mortal fear of discovery alone would have effected that almost all newly converted would have again thrown the dangerous Heretic faith overboard sooner or later. However, if some steadfast ones nonetheless remained true to the new faith, if they even tried to initiate friends and neighbours in their secrets, they thus committed to a risk which lead these braves into the inquisition dungeons with almost absolute certainty. Because the opportunities for their discovery were countless of course. There were the "good friends", who would broadcast in the neighbourhood every conspicuous change in the life conduct of their acquaintance, who had to carry forth every careless word from house to house. And that all the more so, if with the secretive neighbour, it was about suspicious sounding words on all things faith. All the world knew that, by death penalty, one was not allowed to talk in any way insidiously! Who could trust the neighbour, no matter how harmlessly they was listening? And the enemies even, who one had in the place, and who were always lurking to tighten the noose shut! There were the relatives of the own family of the Heretic – for example the "little girls" instructed in the gospel – who could let slip a thoughtless statement unexpectedly. There were servants and maids who were talking, in the neighbourhood, about "secrecies" in the house of their masters. Often enough, by the way, one hears of informers in the inquisition protocols as well. There were for example members of the sect who one day, reconciled with the church again, and then, in order to document the truthfulness of their renunciation, denounced their companions. Primarily however, what one has to realise is the ongoing spying for suspects of the inquisition's helpers' helpers, in order to recognise that in the long run, it was impossible for even the skilled and careful to keep their "secrecy" towards the world. These track-hounds, too, knew how to disguise themselves in order to get onto certain secrecies. It is told that there was a cleric who went "to those of whom he had scouted that they belong to the sect". They gave themselves "with great artfulness of disguise the appearance as if they belonged to the same religious party. The unsuspecting ones then believed them, and revealed to them all their secrets."[19]

It could now be that a particularly sceptical and curious reader might ask me: if one cannot and must not trust the falsified tradition – then how do you know how the people thought and felt in the Middle Ages? How do you know so certainly that even in the Middle Ages, there was rumouring about the neighbours' secrecies, that even back then, discord, envy and vindictiveness existed amongst people? If you don't have it black on white in the archives, how do you want to know that there were once informers and spies amongst people? The great majority of my readers will hear these questions with a smirk; because everybody is not at least a little bit unclear from where I draw my wisdom. However, dear and curious reader: from the archives, I do *not* have my wisdom!

All in all: the danger of being discovered, and burnt as a Heretic, was under the described circumstances so threatening and great, that the by the falsified sources reported, monstrous boom of Heresy,

in the real world, means a thing of impossibility. Nobody who is willing to give more credibility to the living experience than the falsified paper tradition, will be able to escape this realisation. For the time being, however, the historians are not willing to trust experience; inhibiting cause is their abundant paper knowledge. They have of course very thoroughly examined through the sources, and, will you look at that, now they really come with a, from the paper tradition drawn, "sufficient explanation" for the despite all persecution so super-powerfully swelling Hereticdom! One is not to forget, they shout, the Heretics have very cleverly disguised themselves from their persecutors. And now, one reminds me of the previously mentioned distinction of the Heretics between Perfecti and Credentes.

So, from the sources, it followed that only the Perfecti had made themselves free and kept away from the official church, but that the common believers despite their Heretic stance, going by outward appearances, soulful-peacefully – and cleverly – supposedly remained in the lap of the loathed church. "It is known", says Dieckhoff (p 127), "that the Waldensians during that time [namely during the time before the reformation; K.], by appearance, attached themselves to the cult of the Roman church, and at any rate, did not outwardly refuse obedience; that they much rather, by appearance, lived according to the laws of the Roman church, confessed to the priests, heard mass, paid the tithe etc. The peculiar, christian (!) life in the sect was restricted to the hearing of the secret sermons of the so-called Barbes [preacher brothers; K], and the secret confession to the same." Now then, the historians shout; if the believers were capable of disguising themselves that cleverly, is it then any wonder, that Heresy was able to mightily spread? Unfortunately, it follows from the falsified sources themselves, that not all Credentes at all, and not at all times at all, that these common believers remained, by appearance, obedient children of the church for reasons of caution. The sources starkly contradict each other with regards to the position of the Heretics to the official church. Above, we have already listed one example of this contradiction. The just now quoted statement by Dieckhoff has supposedly validity only for the time immediately before the reformation, i.e. approximately for the last half of the 15th century. *Before*, the Credentes have supposedly separated from the church much more bluntly, other sources announce.

But just let us once suppose that the Credentes, i.e. the main mass of the Heretics, had one and all, and at all times, outwardly carried on participating in the customs of the church for reasons of caution. Only now and then, they had, in all secrecy, heard sermons with their wandering apostles, and confessed. What? Were these peculiar saints now safe from the tentacles and the spying eyes of the inquisition?? Certainly, they were *not as quickly* caught as those braves, who, after the conversion to the sect belief, ostentatiously kept away from the church. When a Christian, all of a sudden, would no longer go to confession or to mass at all, then they had themselves quite obviously revealed to be Heretics, and in such a case, the inquisition would not have hesitated for long before probing the daredevil a little closer. Then, however, were those now, who outwardly still participated in all church customs in order to not stick out as Heretics, protected from discovery by these safety precautions? After all, they had their "secrecies"! They came together in secret

places in order to listen to the sermon of their apostles. Yes, they set to work with the greatest caution; but was this "caution" not the greatest carelessness, which the Heretics committed, in the face of the thousandfold threatening danger? All the possibilities of discovery that we have mentioned before – suspicion of the good and hostile neighbours, thoughtless statements of a sect member, informerdom and spying – *are of course options especially with the "secret" Heretics*! Preferentially, the inquisition tracked down such secret Heretics with zeal! For the Heretics, the danger of discovery was decreased by nothing, if they "else, stuck to the church hypocritically"; the discovery of their secrecy would at best be delayed a little. "Nonetheless, this secret nature of the Waldensians was by no means a secret", Dieckhoff declares, too. (p 127) Thus, sooner or later, even the greatest secrecies of the Heretic conventicles would have come to daylight, be it by an unfortunate coincidence, be it by denunciation or spying. But oh wonder: in the ink world of the paper tradition, the Heretics multiply so rapidly and uninhibitedly as if such things as the inquisition and the stake had never existed! The Heretics multiplied like the sand by the sea[XX].

Some researchers now still have in store a second sufficient explanation, in order to render explainable, why the flood of Heresy could "really" swell as the falsified sources illustrate to us. This explanation is: the inquisition saw itself *inhibited* in its operation. It is well-known of course now, that the church in the extermination of the Heretics was depending on the support of the *secular* powers; but the secular Princes were often sluggish in this respect, yes, they sometimes, as some sources claim to know, made a compact directly with the Heretics. In such awkward position, the arm of the inquisition could naturally not grip as tightly as would have been desirable in the interest of the church. That sounds of course reasonable now. If the Princes were really sluggish, or even opposed the inquisition, then of course, the seed of Heresy could exuberantly run wild. Significantly however, even the sources report only of quite sporadic, and seen on the whole, insignificant cases of sluggishness of the secular reigning Princes towards Hereticdom. Only once now and then, according to the source statements, has any subordinate secular master held his protective hand over the Heretics, but those were always *geographically and temporally limited* occurrences. Such Heretic protectors, one and all, had to bitterly suffer for their actions, and after a short protection period, these Heretics, too, were outlawed, and had to climb the stakes. On the other hand, the almost exceptionless rule is, *that the secular greats, and especially the most powerful* [!] *reigning Princes and sovereigns to the utmost, have always most proven to be at the beck and call of the inquisition*! Why, the Princes' readiness to join the church in the extermination of Heresy by all means is such a conspicuous phenomenon, that lately, a researcher, Hashagen, talks of the "uncanny activity of the laymen in fighting Heretics".[20] "Towards Heresy, which else, during the later Middle Ages, spread in all circles of society, these Princes remained almost completely immune." (Hashagen, p 52)

In a sheer wonderful manner, the Kings and reigning Princes remained not only immune, but often, they still outdid the measures of the clerical authorities by decrees, which testify to a "blind fanaticism"

[XX] Sand doesn't multiply, does it? I would have chosen 'rabbits', but I'm only the 'translator'.

against Heresy. So Emperor Charles IV., whom one has called the "parson Emperor"[XXI] and "hangman's assistant of popedom" with justification. "The Emperor employs the most extravagant idioms, in order to express their reverence for this holy office [of the inquisition; K.] and the inquisitors, these fore-fighters and keepers of the faith."[21] In another book by the way, we will have to treat in a little more detail on the position of the Kings and reigning Princes towards Hereticdom. Here, the statement suffices: there can be no talk at all of the inquisition being "inhibited" by the secular greats; all worldly places of power and influence have, to the contrary, demonstrated a sheer unbelievable zeal, when the task was to devastatingly attack Heresy.

With this, the by research presented, allegedly "sufficient explanations" for the monstrous swelling of Heresy in the late Middle Ages have turned out to be obsolete. Much rather, it is as it was: from the described psychological reasons follows with the absolute certainty of a living experience, *that in the Middle Ages, Hereticdom in the monstrous dissemination*, the way the falsified tradition pretends, *cannot have existed at all*. In the later Middle Ages, Hereticdom could have made gains and defended them on the described enormous scale only, if – like after the reformation! – powerful secular reigning Princes, primarily some sovereigns, had stepped up as strong and lasting protectors and promoters of the Heretics. The following hint may serve to strengthen our listed reasons: "Just think of the most meagre progress made by protestantism nowadays, *without* the existence of the inquisition… That handful of Protestants, who appeared there in Charles V. final time and in Philipp II.'s first days, has soon been extirpated by the energy of the Spanish monarchy and the Spanish church authorities."[22] So, the medieval sources lie as fast as a horse can trot, when they want to tell us of Heresy that, from small beginnings, by and by, it accumulates to a gigantic flood.

So, in the Middle Ages, there were no Heretics, at least not in significant numbers? Yes, there was a Hereticdom in the Middle Ages, too. Heresy was even far more widespread than the source reports give away. I remind the readers that I have declared once before: no matter how many lies the falsified sources may well dish up on the names and teachings of the sects, there can be no doubt that in the Middle Ages, Heretics as opponents of Rome existed in monstrous masses! With this, we stand before the dilemma anew: on the one hand, there could not have been that many Heretics – on the other hand, Heresy was even more spread than the source reports indicate.

The reader is shaking their head. What are they to make of this screaming dissonance? Therefore, I will rush now to bring about a solution to the contradiction that appears to present itself here. With the solution to the contradiction, we will also gain full clarity on the root cause of the falsification action.

[XXI] Orig. Ger.: 'Pfaffenkaiser'; see also footnote I in the table of contents.

6. The so-called schism of the church as the root cause of the falsification action

Following the tumultuous election of pope Urban IV., as a result of a chain of peculiar events in the year 1378, that great split cracked open in Christianity, which has been designated the *schism*. On the alleged origin of this schism, or the development, and the eventual settling of the split, we do not have to negotiate in this place; a thorough discussion of this affair remains reserved for a new book. Here, the hint shall suffice that since 1378, Christianity suddenly saw *two* popes, and since the council to Pisa (1409), even *three* popes as supreme herders attend to their duties. In the same way now, in which the two/three popes fought each other as rivals, so the christian herd, too, fell apart into two and three hostile groups. A monstrous confusion took over split Christianity, and the question became ever more pressing and mysterious: *who now is the "right" pope then*? "The pressure of the schism was… monstrous… by the fact that it, the longer it lasted, and the more it became evident that the "right" pope could not be found, simply rendered absurd, and cancelled in itself, all arguments from valid church law."[23] *It could not be established who is the right pope*! That is the pivot point, the historical quintessence of the falsified tradition on the schism of popedom.

Towards the end of the Middle Ages, we see Christianity split into several great groups; each group is headed by a "pope" as chief herder. "History" reports: this state of being split dates back from the year 1378 onwards. Before, Christianity was *unified*, had only one pope, namely in the person of the bishop of Rome! The reader is to note: crucial is the alleged, since the oldest times existing *unity* of the whole of Christianity under the supreme leadership of the *Roman* pope. By the schism, this unity of the church has supposedly been disturbed and suspended only temporarily.

This allegedly since the oldest times existing unity of Christianity under one, namely the Roman pope, is the greatest purpose lie of the falsified medieval "history". The truth is: *the division of Christianity into independent subgroups* – into regional or national churches – *represents the original state. Only towards the end of the Middle Ages, the unity of Christianity, the merging of the individual national churches into the one general (catholic) universal church, and simultaneously with that, the Roman universal popedom by deception and force, became a reality*.

The solution of the contradiction in the affair of the medieval "Heretics" follows from this next realisation. Had a *unified* universal church with a (Roman) universal pope as the head of a general priest hierarchy existed in the Middle Ages, then, the clerical central authority, via its inquisition, and under the willing support of the secular Firsts, could have soon crushed any emerging Heretic movement, and would have indeed destroyed it root and branch. In the Middle Ages now, however, there did neither exist a universal church comprising of the whole of Christianity, nor did there exist a (Roman) universal pope. After all, our discussion of the religious-psychological mystery of popedom's Babylonian exile concluded with the result: a

tradition of the Sedes Romana, i.e. the seat of popedom in Rome, has not at all been present in the Christian consciousness at the time of the alleged exile. Also: throughout the entire Middle Ages, Rome was an insignificant herders' village; thus, a "pope" has not resided in Rome during the Middle Ages! The one event causes and supports the other. Just because Rome was not the seat and the city of the popes, that is why the tradition of the Sedes Romana had to be missing, too. During the Middle Ages, however, the pope has not perhaps resided to Avignon or elsewhere. Because there was no pope back then, i.e. a chief herder of a unified Christianity. Christianity was much rather divided into independent groups, namely the individual regional churches.

With regards to the dogmas, everything that is portrayed by the falsified sources as Hereticdom, applies to these individual *regional churches*. What I mean is this: until towards the end of the Middle Ages, the different regional churches were very much hierarchy-free communities, who, under rejection of any force in questions of faith, had promoted the dogma-less gospel of Christ to the exclusive foundation of life and faith. Thus, *all* Christians represented – up to the late medieval forced unification – an evangelical [protestant] "Hereticdom"! "Evangelical" – taken in the pre-reformational sense! What the sources want to portray as occasional phenomena, as exceptions, just this evangelical Hereticdom, was in truth the prevalent form of christian faith life until around the end of the Middle Ages. *The evangelical "Heretics" existed before the Roman hierarchy*! Only when before and during the "schism" period, the regional churches were forcefully unified under one pope, when with the newly created priest hierarchy, the new "catholic" dogmas were introduced, and many communities were in no mind of amicably submit to the new things and powers now – only then, the obstinates were stigmatised and persecuted. In this way it is explained, from where the many "Heretics" in the late Middle Ages come.

So, what was the root cause of the great history falsification action? Viewed by the description of the falsified tradition, the root cause lies in the "schism" of the allegedly previously unified popedom. When voices were raised back then: "… that it be of little importance how many popes there were, whether two or three, whether ten or twelve; every country could have their own independent pope" (P. I, p 141); when one strove hard in vain to demonstrate by legal conduct of evidence, just who actually be the *right* pope now, and *why* he be the right one – then, the thought was born to clarify by *historical* conduct of evidence, that on the basis of the "tradition" only the *Roman* pope be the right chief herder of Christianity. The real history knew nothing of such a tradition, because during all medieval centuries, a universal pope had not even existed yet. Thus, a pope in the modern sense of the word (as chief herder of unified Christianity), had neither resided to Rome, nor to Avignon, nor elsewhere. On the one hand, the independently of each other existing evangelical national churches had a clerical administration and leadership, but this administration was not at work in the form of a civil servant-style priest hierarchy. When then, certain circles decided upon the creation of a universal church (for the unification of all national churches into the one general, catholic superchurch), that was the moment when the hour of the birth of universal popedom also came. But where should this supreme

herder reside? Real history remained silent on this question, because it did not know of a pope as leader of unified Christianity. The question however: who shall be pope, and where shall he reside? had to be once and for all answered by irrefutable facts, and thus ultimately decided for all times. In future, there should not be the slightest possibility to doubt, where popedom, by divine decision, have its eternal seat, and that only *one* man be the *right* pope, namely the Roman bishop as Peter's successor.

True history remained altogether silent on hierarchy and popedom as such, thus knew nothing of a Roman tradition of the popes. Real history did not prove, what simply had to be historically proven now; so, one erased it, and, on the empty area, erected the pseudo-historical purpose building, that stands before our eyes in the falsified medieval tradition. How beautifully now did the substitute history prove the "historical development" of the priest hierarchy and its glorious pinnacle, the Roman popedom. The insignificant herders' village on the shores of the river Tiber, could thus, with the aid of ink and parchment, be transformed into the christian world capital city of the Middle Ages, into the Rome of the popes. On the sheets of parchment, the phantasy city Rome was promoted to the centre of world history, from which culture streams poured forth into all areas of the Occident. Thus did the newly fabricated paper tradition of the Middle Ages teach and prove. – Our investigations have now arrived at a temporary stop. Drenched by a flood of new realisations, the surprised reader stands still and looks back. But they also look forward, and see a host of new and exceedingly urgent questions approaching fast. There is for example the big question emerging: how do things stand with the true historical *development of Christianity*, if, up to the threshold to modern times, no under popedom unified overall church existed at all? Then, how and when did Christianity really originate? The reader now expects, with understandable commotion, answers to such burning questions, and I will answer all of the questions for them, too. It is however quite impossible to work off all questions in one breath; much rather, I will have to continue the investigations in further books.

In the next Book, the *course of the falsification action* will be reported upon.

Endnotes

[1] Hergenröthers Handbuch der allgem. Kirchengeschichte [Handbook of the General History of the Church], 5th ed., 1915, vol. 3, p 8 (abbreviated in the text: He.)

[2] A von Reumont – Geschichte der Stadt Rom [History of the Town of Rome], vol. 2, 1867, p 716 f. (R.)

[3] A Hauck – Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands [Church History of Germany], pt. 5, 2nd half, 1920, p 672 (H.)

[4] F Gregorovius – Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter [History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages], vol. 6, 1867, p 186 (Gr.)

[5] L Pastor – Geschichte der Päpste [History of the Popes], vol. 1, 1886, p 59 (P.)

[6] F Papencordt – Geschichte der Stadt Rom, 1857, p 438, footnote 1 (P.)

[7] F Papencordt – Cola di Rienzo und seine Zeit […and his Time], 1841, p 38 (Co.)

[8] Beschreibung der Stadt Rom [Description of the City of Rome] by E Platner, C Bunsen, E Gerhard and W Röstell, vol. 1, 1830, p 254

[9] Chr U Hahn – Geschichte der Ketzer im Mittelalter [History of the Heretics in the Middle Ages], vol.1, p 64 (Ha.)

[10] L Flathe – Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation [History of the Predecessors of Reformation], Pt. 1, 1835, p 263 (F.)

[11] K Müller – Die Wladenser und ihre einzelnen Gruppen [The Waldensians and their individual groups], p 118 (M)

[12] W Dieckhoff – Die Waldenser im Mittelalter [The Waldensians in the Middle Ages], 1851, p 169, D.)

[13] L Keller – Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien [The Reformation and the older Reform Parties], 1885, p 12 (K.)

[14] Realencyklopädie für protestant. Theologie und Kirche [Real Encyclopedia for Protestant Theology and Church], vol. 16, 1905, p 421/422

[15] Fr Thudichum – Papsttum und Reformation im Mittelalter [Popedom and Reformation in the Middle Ages], 1903, p 8

[16] Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 2nd ed., 1927, vol. 1, p 851

[17] Deutsche Zeitschrift for Geschichtswissenschaft [German Magazine for Historical Science], vol. 3, 1890, p 353

[18] L Förg – Die Ketzerverfolgung in Deutschland unter Gregor IV. [Heretic Persecution under Gregory IV.], Historische Studien [Historical Studies] Book 218, 1932, p 21

[19] Fr Hoffmann – Geschichte der Inquisition [History of the…], vol. 1, 1878, p 51

[20] I Hashagen – Staat und Kirche vor der Reformation [State and Church before the…], 1931, p 66

[21] Historische Zeitschrift [Historical Magazine] vol. 41, 1879, p 197

[22] Historisches Jahrbuch [Historical Annual] vol. 24, 1903, p 593/594

[23] H Heimpel – Dietrich von Niem 1932, p 110

Addendum

Just so there are no misunderstandings:

0%

That is the part of the translation performed by translation 'software', which will NEVER be able to grasp the fineties ☺ of language.